

concerning the coinage of gold and silver, with a view of submitting some remarks.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BAYARD. May I ask the Chair before the question is put on the motion for an executive session, whether any understanding is reached as to the time of voting on the tariff-commission bill?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. No, sir; objection was made to any understanding. The bill remains the unfinished business for to-morrow, the Senator from New York [Mr. MILLER] having the floor upon it. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After one hour and forty-two minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at five o'clock and twenty-two minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, March 23, 1882.

The House met at twelve o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. F. D. POWER.

The Journal of yesterday was read and approved.

INTERNAL REVENUE.

Mr. DUNNELL, by unanimous consent, reported back from the Committee on Ways and Means the bill (H. R. No. 5237) to amend the laws relating to internal revenue, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. No. 579) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Missouri River at or near Arrow Rock, Missouri, and that the same be considered at this time.

Mr. PAGE. If it does not elicit any debate I will not object; otherwise I must object.

Mr. HATCH. There will be no debate at all.

There being no objection, the Committee of the Whole was discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and the same was brought before the House.

Mr. HATCH. This bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with sundry amendments, and there are other amendments which I desire to have adopted.

Mr. PAGE. I will say that this bill was reported unanimously from the Committee on Commerce.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] desires to amend the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. HATCH. It is with the consent of the gentleman from Minnesota, [Mr. WASHBURN,] who has charge of the bill. The amendments are principally verbal amendments, and are intended to make the bill conform to the one for the same purpose reported by the Committee on Commerce of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The amendments will be read.

The amendments were read, as follows:

In lines 3 and 4 of the printed bill strike out the word "railroad" and insert in lieu thereof the word "railway."

In line 6 of section 2, after the words "the United States," insert the words "or passengers or freight passing over said bridge."

Add to section 1 the words "for such reasonable rates of toll as may be approved from time to time by the Secretary of War."

In section 3, lines 10 and 11, strike out the words "the draw or pivot shall be over the main channel of the river at an accessible navigable point" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the draw or pivot shall be at or near that shore nearest the channel of the river where, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, a passage through the draw at that point can be constantly maintained; if not so constructed, then the pier to be in the main channel, and the opening or passage-way to be so constructed that water-craft can be worked through it by lines, when not safe to pass otherwise."

Mr. WASHBURN. I will state that these amendments have been submitted to me, and there is no objection to them.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection, the question will be taken upon the amendments in gross.

There was no objection, and the amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was as follows.

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be lawful for the Hannibal and Southwestern Railway Company, a corporation duly and legally incorporated under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Missouri, its assigns or successors, to construct and maintain a bridge, and approaches thereto, over the Missouri River at or near Arrow Rock, in the county of Saline, in said State. Said bridge shall be constructed to provide for the passage of railway trains, and, at the option of the persons by whom it may be built, may be used for the passage of wagons and vehicles of all kinds, for the transit of animals, and for foot-passengers, for such reasonable rates of toll as may be approved from time to time by the Secretary of War.

SEC. 2. That any bridge built under this act, and subject to its limitations, shall be a lawful structure, and shall be recognized and known as a post-route, upon which also no higher charges shall be made for the transmission over the same of the mails, the troops, and the munitions of war of the United States, or passengers or freight passing over said bridge, than the rate per mile paid for the transportation

over the railroad or public highways leading to the said bridge; and it shall enjoy the rights and privileges of other post-roads in the United States.

SEC. 3. That if said bridge shall be made with unbroken and continuous spans, the spans thereof shall not be less than three hundred feet in length in the clear, and the main span shall be over the main channel of the river. The lowest part of the superstructure of said bridge shall be at least fifty feet above extreme high-water mark, as understood at the point of location, and the bridge shall be at right angles to, and its piers parallel with, the current of the river: *Provided*, That if the same shall be constructed as a draw-bridge, the draw or pivot shall be at or near that shore nearest the channel of the river where, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, a passage through the draw at that point can be consistently maintained; if not so constructed, then the pier to be in the main channel, and the opening or passage-way to be so constructed that water-craft can be worked through it by lines, when not safe to pass otherwise; and the spans shall not be less than one hundred and sixty feet in length in the clear, and the piers of said bridge shall be parallel with, and the bridge itself at right angles to, the current of the river, and the spans shall not be less than ten feet above extreme high-water mark, as understood at the point of location, to the lowest part of the superstructure of said bridge: *Provided, also*, That said draw shall be opened promptly upon reasonable signal for the passing of boats; and said company or corporation shall maintain, at its own expense, from sunset till sunrise, such lights or other signals on said bridge as the Light-House Board shall prescribe. No bridge shall be erected or maintained under the authority of this act which shall at any time substantially or materially obstruct the free navigation of said river; and if any bridge erected under such authority shall, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, obstruct such navigation, he is hereby authorized to cause such change or alteration of said bridge to be made as will effectually obviate such obstruction; and all such alterations shall be made and all such obstructions be removed at the expense of the owner or owners of said bridge. And in case of any litigation arising from any obstruction or alleged obstruction to the free navigation of said river caused or alleged to be caused by said bridge, the case may be brought in the district court of the United States of the State of Missouri in which any portion of said obstruction or bridge may be located: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be so construed as to repeal or modify any of the provisions of law now existing in reference to the protection of the navigation of rivers, or to exempt this bridge from the operation of the same.

SEC. 4. That all railroad companies desiring the use of said bridge shall have and be entitled to equal rights and privileges relative to the passage of railway trains over the same, and over the approaches thereto, upon payment of a reasonable compensation for such use; and in case the owner or owners of said bridge and the several railroad companies, or any one of them desiring such use shall fail to agree upon the sum or sums to be paid, and upon rules and conditions to which each shall conform in using said bridge, all matters at issue between them shall be decided by the Secretary of War upon a hearing of the allegations and proofs of the parties.

SEC. 5. That any bridge authorized to be constructed under this act shall be built and located under and subject to such regulations for the security of navigation of said river as the Secretary of War shall prescribe; and to secure that object the said company or corporation shall submit to the Secretary of War, for his examination and approval, a design and drawings of the bridge and a map of the location, giving, for the space of one mile above and one mile below the proposed location, the topography of the banks of the river, the shore-lines at high and low water, the direction and strength of the currents at all stages, and the soundings, accurately showing the bed of the stream, the location of any other bridge or bridges, and shall furnish such other information as may be required for a full and satisfactory understanding of the subject; and until the said plan and location of the bridge are approved by the Secretary of War the bridge shall not be built; and should any change be made in the plan of said bridge during the progress of construction such change shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of War.

SEC. 6. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill as amended was then ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HATCH moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. WHITE. I ask unanimous consent to put a bill on its passage.

Mr. PAGE. I must ask for the regular order.

Mr. WHITE. If this bill elicits discussion or objection I will withdraw it.

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Ohio. I ask the gentleman from California to withdraw his call for the regular order that I may present a report.

Mr. PAGE. I am willing that reports may be made for a few moments; but all this time comes out of the discussion on the Chinese bill.

Mr. POUND. What is the use of having reports made if we cannot consider them?

AMENDMENT OF REVISED STATUTES.

Mr. SPAULDING. I ask unanimous consent to report from the Committee on Military Affairs a bill prepared in accordance with the request of the War Department.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. No. 5379) to amend sections 1298 and 1302 of the Revised Statutes of the United States was reported, read a first and second time, placed on the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PRINTING FOR COMMITTEE ON COINAGE, WEIGHTS, AND MEASURES.

Mr. SPRINGER. I rise to make a privileged report. The Committee on Printing, to whom was referred a resolution in regard to printing certain matter for the use of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, have instructed me to report back the resolution with a recommendation that it be adopted.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures be authorized to print the testimony taken before the committee in regard to establishment of new mints, as well as the needs and requirements of the Philadelphia mint and New York assay office, for the convenience and use of the committee as well as for the information of members of the House.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. SPRINGER moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted, and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

CUSTOMS REVENUES.

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to present another privileged report. The Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. R. No. 170) to provide for printing certain documents relating to customs revenues for the use of Congress, have directed me to report back the resolution with a recommendation that it be passed. The joint resolution was reported originally from the Committee on Ways and Means by its chairman, [Mr. KELLEY,] and referred to the Committee on Printing, with the recommendation of that committee in favor of the printing.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, &c., That the Public Printer be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to print for the use of Congress 10,000 copies of Senate Miscellaneous Document No. 46, first session Forty-sixth Congress, with additional data showing the imports for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1879, 1880, and 1881, inclusive, together with a comparative statement of the rates of duties and imposts under the several tariff acts from 1789 to 1870, both inclusive, the tariff acts from 1871 to 1874, and the tariff on imports under the Revised Statutes and subsequent tariff acts issued by the Treasury Department, and known as Document No. 73 of that Department.

SEC. 2. That the documents described in the foregoing section be stitched and bound as one volume; that 7,000 copies of the same be for the use of the House of Representatives and 3,000 for the use of the Senate.

Mr. SPRINGER. I ask for the reading of the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Printing, to whom was referred joint resolution (H. R. No. 170) to provide for printing certain documents relating to customs revenues for the use of Congress, having had the same under consideration, have directed me to report the resolution back and recommend its passage. This joint resolution was reported from the Committee on Ways and Means with a recommendation that it pass, (Report No. 757 to accompany joint resolution 170.) The printing of this information being desired by the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Printing deem it unnecessary to offer further reasons for the printing of the work intended.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. I would like to inquire whether the volume proposed to be printed is that known as the report on commerce and navigation?

Mr. KELLEY. No, sir. It is a compilation of the tariff laws exhibiting the rates of duty ad valorem and specific, &c. It comes from the Bureau of Statistics, and is the first official compilation of our tariff rates, &c., that has been made for popular circulation.

Mr. HEWITT, of New York. Then this is not such a document as we have had heretofore, but a new document?

Mr. KELLEY. A new document entirely, although it embodies three publications.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SPRINGER moved to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

INDIAN AGENT, GREEN BAY, WISCONSIN.

Mr. POUND. I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill No. 864 be taken from the Speaker's table and put upon its passage now.

The title of the bill was read, as follows:

A bill (S. No. 864) to confirm certain instructions given by the Department of the Interior to the Indian agent at Green Bay agency, in the State of Wisconsin, and to legalize the acts done and permitted by said Indian agent pursuant thereto.

Mr. SPRINGER. I must object to the consideration of that bill at this time.

Mr. POUND. I think the gentleman will withdraw his objection if he will hear the bill read.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman from California [Mr. PAGE] has insisted that we cannot go now into the consideration of matters requiring time, as I think this bill will.

Mr. RANDALL. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the morning hour for reports of committees.

Mr. POUND. I desire to ask the gentleman from Illinois whether he will not permit this bill to be read.

Mr. SPRINGER. It would involve discussion, and the gentleman from California [Mr. PAGE] has insisted that he cannot allow anything to come in now that will consume time.

Mr. POUND. The gentleman from Illinois himself enjoyed the courtesy of the House a moment ago.

Mr. SPRINGER. I did not "enjoy the courtesy of the House." I presented two privileged reports.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California yield a moment for the presentation of a report by the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. TOWNSEND?]

Mr. PAGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Ohio. I ask consent to report from the Committee on Commerce, to be printed and placed on the Calendar, a substitute for House bill No. 204, supplementary to an act approved December 17, 1872, entitled "An act to authorize the construction of

bridges across the Ohio River, and to prescribe the dimensions of the same."

Mr. RANDALL. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The call for the regular order is equivalent to an objection. The regular order is the morning hour for reports from committees.

Mr. PAGE. I move to dispense with the morning hour.

The motion was agreed to, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. EVINS, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for ten days on account of important business.

INDIAN DEPREDAATION CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER, by unanimous consent, laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a list of Indian depredation claims presented prior to March 15, 1882; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. SYMPSON, one of its clerks, announced the passage of the following bills, in which concurrence was requested:

An act (S. No. 930) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the sale of the remainder of the reservation of the confederated Otoe and Missouri tribes of Indians in the States of Nebraska and Kansas, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1881; and

An act (S. No. 1510) for the relief of John H. Schabinger, guardian of Susan McKnatt and Martha McKnatt, minor daughters of James McKnatt, deceased.

It further announced the passage of the bill (H. R. No. 3830) making appropriations for the consular and diplomatic service of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1883, and for other purposes, with amendments in which concurrence was requested.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. PAGE. I demand the regular order of business.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the further consideration of the bill (S. No. 71) to execute certain treaty stipulations relating to Chinese, on which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHERWIN] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. SHERWIN. Mr. Speaker, this is not a bill to promote the civilization of the Chinese Empire. It is not a bill to encourage the spread of the Christian religion. As important as are both those objects, they lie without the scope of our duties. We are sent here by our constituents to legislate for the people of the United States under the Constitution and the laws, limited by international agreements and the usual morality which obtains between nations. I propose, then, to address myself to the bill before us which is to regulate the admission of Chinese laborers into our country. For many years the presence of a large number of Chinese laborers in the States of California, Nevada, and Oregon has caused great and continuous social and political disturbances there. Those disturbances have been the occasion of the grossest demagoguery and have led to violent assaults by certain classes of people upon the persons and property of unoffending Chinese. With these manifestations I have no sympathy whatever. The rights of every Chinaman in the United States should be as jealously guarded as are the rights of any native of the country. This is demanded alike by natural justice and international good faith. While admitting this, I wish to say that the universal opinion of those States, recorded as it has been frequently as opposed to a further increase of Chinese immigration, should in my opinion be respectfully heeded and should carry great weight in this discussion. It will not do for us to stigmatize the action and opinions of nearly all the citizens of three States of this Union as the artful schemes of demagogues. Those States have been built up by the labors and intelligence of the best people of our older Commonwealths by men of intellect, virtue, patriotism, and courage, who have carried our institutions and our flag to that farthest shore and added an increased luster to the American name. I prefer the verdict of such a people, founded upon a knowledge of all the facts surrounding this question, to the opinions of theorists and doctrinaires.

That the presence of the Chinese in California has been detrimental to good order, hurtful to society, and injurious to labor has been established by a large body of the most trustworthy evidence, taken at different times by different persons. The Congressional committee, of which Senator Morton was chairman, after an exhaustive examination, reported in favor of legislation looking to the regulation of this subject. The demand for some regulation at last became so great that our Government sent a special embassy to China two years ago to treat with that government upon the subject, and the treaty entered into by them is the basis of the bill now before us.

I believe that I fully appreciate the importance of the proposed law. I am aware that it is a new departure in our intercourse with a foreign government; and yet I am fully convinced that the time for that departure has fully come.

This is a matter of practical politics, and not of sentiment. Republican government is not on trial. The Christian religion is not in danger. Justice is not to be outraged. Do not let us enter into the hazy atmosphere of irrelevant generalizations to discover reasons for voting against this bill. Because we have declared in favor of the

right of expatriation do not let us admit that it is our solemn duty to admit to citizenship every man who expatriates himself from another land, whether he be pauper, criminal, or pagan. Do not let us mix up eternal truth and confuse our moral perceptions by likening the black laws of some of our States before the war with the provisions of this bill, which simply suspends for a short time the coming here of certain classes of a certain nationality. As well might we accuse a manufacturer who positively forbids the entrance of any one upon his premises except his employes of being inhuman and unjust to his neighbors and fellow-men.

We do not deny the equality of man. We still assert that all men are born free and equal, but we claim the right to control our own workshops and choose our own associates. It is not necessary for us to assert our superiority over the Chinese mentally or morally. We know that the Chinaman, in his own country and in ours, is industrious, faithful, saving, patient. We know that he has sufficient education to transact his own business, and frequently achieves success in it, and yet it does not follow that we desire him for a neighbor, or that we wish to admit him to membership in our social partnership. What right has he to expect it? What right has any one upon this floor to demand it?

The opposition to the bill is based upon several grounds. First, that it is unnecessary; secondly, that it is against the policy of our Constitution and laws; thirdly, that it goes beyond the power conferred by the treaty, and fourthly, it will injure us commercially. It is said to be unnecessary because the number of Chinese now in the country is so small as to preclude the idea of their doing any injury, and it is claimed that but few are now coming. If it is conceded that their immigration here may ever become an evil it is not too soon too check it. Had African slavery been abolished one hundred years ago, how much of dissension, of treasure, of precious blood would it have saved to this nation? When Utah was admitted as a Territory if polygamy had been excluded how great a stain upon our escutcheon would have been avoided, and how small the difficulty to extricate it, compared with that which now confronts us. Slavery was confined to one section of the Union, and yet it debased the whole. Polygamy is confined to a far-distant, secluded Territory, and yet the nation is to-day awake to its shame, and aroused with indignation at its assumptions and at its defiance of the moral law. Chinese immigration is segregated upon the Pacific slope. We hear the united voice of the people of three States lifted up to Congress to prevent any further influx of laborers of that nationality. They show to us that their presence is a great evil; that it leads to race hatred, to political disquietude; that it debases white labor and laborers; that it has invaded many kinds of trades, and driven the white tradesmen out of them, and is gradually but surely seizing all kinds of business. Besides all these evils they constitute an alien population of totally foreign tastes, habits, and purposes, and are a constant source of social discord.

When the people of the Pacific States complain of these things some gentlemen here say, "Why do you employ them, then? If you do not want them among you refuse employment to them." That question is a mockery; for we know that any man will employ John Chinaman to do his washing instead of an African woman if John offers to do it for less money. If he will make cigars for less money than a German he will get the work to do. If he will make a pair of shoes for less than an American he gets the job. These are business transactions and have no reference to the Sermon on the Mount or the Declaration of Independence. Now, the fact is that that is just what has been and is being done in the Pacific States to-day. The white working man and woman and artisan is being underbid in wages. The Chinaman will work if necessary for less money than an American can live upon. I do not blame the Chinaman for this, for the lowest wages he would be offered would be greatly larger than the highest he could get in China. There, within an area somewhat less than that portion of the United States lying east of the Mississippi, are crowded over 400,000,000 of people, one-third of the human race. There they and their ancestors have struggled for a scant subsistence for thousands of years. They waste nothing, they wear but little, they eat but little. It is shown by the report of our consul-general at Shanghai that the wages of a superintendent of skilled workmen are \$36 per year over and above his food, rent, and clothing. The wages of a skilled workman are \$13 per year; of an agricultural laborer \$12 per year; of a cooly \$6 per year. A farmer's family with the use of a horse will support themselves and save about \$25 per year. The consul-general says:

With the class of cheap labor of which I have been speaking this empire can supply the world. Is it strange, then, under such circumstances, that the mind of a necessarily more expensive laborer with entirely different hopes and aims in life should become alarmed at the prospect of a stubborn competition with it?

China stands to-day where she has stood for thousands of years, firmly wedded to Joss and her idols, looking backward venerating the paths of her ancestors and with no interest in any civilization but her own.

To show another phase of Chinese life at home, I read from Across America and Asia, by Professor Pumpelly:

On the densely-peopled plain all the organic and much of the mineral ingredients of the soil must have made many times the circuit of plant and animal life. In other words, everything that goes to make and maintain the human body has formed part of human bodies which have passed away.

Few foreigners have the courage to enter the larger southern towns in summer, so horrible is the air. In the neighborhood of great cities on the delta plain, where

water is found just below the surface, one may ride for miles always in sight of coffins bursting in the scorching heat of the sun, and breeding the pestilence that yearly sweeps off the surplus population.

Shall such a people reared amid such environments and with such habits be thrown into competition with our laboring population? In all fields of labor where imitative skill or patient, plodding work is required they will drive our higher civilization to the wall. It has been proved to be so not only in California but in Australia, in Java, and other East Indian islands. Professor Pumpelly further says:

On the island of Java, where they have been long tolerated, the Chinese number not far from 150,000, the greater part having more or less Javan blood. The oppression of the Dutch is the cause of the population not being larger. They are obliged to pay a mulct for leave to enter and a larger one for permission to quit, besides a poll tax, none of which imposts are levied on other foreigners. There are no women in Java who come directly from China; but as the Chinese often marry the daughters of their countrymen by Javan women, there results a numerous mixed race which is often scarcely distinguishable from the native Chinese. Many return to China annually in the junks, but by no means in the same numbers as they arrive. They are governed in matters of inheritance and minor affairs by their own laws, administered by their own officials appointed by the Dutch governor.

Beginning on their arrival as coolies and laborers, they soon accumulate enough to work independently, and many of them amass large fortunes. They have obtained nearly a monopoly of the native produce and an uncontrolled command of their market for foreign commodities. Their industry embraces the whole system of commerce, from the greatest wholesale speculation to the most minute branches of the retail trade. In their hands are all the manufactories, distilleries, potteries, &c., and they have large coffee and sugar plantations. They are equally well adapted for trade or agriculture.

In the English colony of Singapore 50,000 out of a population of 80,000 are Chinamen, chiefly from the island of Hainan. The writer was told that the English owners of a large machine-shop at Singapore were gradually removing their English workmen and replacing them with Chinamen, having found the latter more docile, sober, and enduring, and, with the same amount of instruction, equally skillful. So successful is their competition that Parsees, Jews, and Europeans can retain no foothold in face of it.

In the midst of all this patient toil they are still Chinese, faithful to the traditions of their ancestors, holding a profound veneration for her immemorial laws and institutions, and looking with contempt upon the institutions of the country wherein they reside. Under English jurisdiction some of them have been naturalized. But whenever they return to their own country they always take up with their old customs, and still remain true to their religion and institutions.

Thus we see that in all countries where they have lived their presence has been followed by the same state of things—race hatred and a refusal and inability to assimilate with the people with whom they are domiciled.

The real and essential object of all civilized government is to protect its citizens against injustice and wrong, and in all proper ways to aid in their development and progress. In other words, government is for the good of its citizens, and in a federal government likewise for the good of its several parts. It is therefore the duty of Congress to take some action in this matter tending to remove the great wrong and injustice under which the people of California and other Pacific States are now suffering.

I wish now, Mr. Speaker, to refer for a few moments to the attempts which have been made in this debate to magnify the trade and commerce of the United States with the Chinese Empire. I have culled some statistics on that point, to which I ask the attention of the House. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] this morning depicted to us the consternation which spread over the English nation because the United States was driving them from their commerce with China. I have here an article in the Fortnightly Review for 1878, written by a gentleman who evidently is conversant with China and all her interests, in which he states that the total trade of China for that year was \$212,483,357. That is the total trade of China, both imports and exports. Now, of that sum the import and export trade with the United States amounted to only \$20,914,301, or a little less than one-tenth of the whole. England's share of the trade of China, on the contrary, was more than 60 per cent. of the whole. The total exports to China from Great Britain and Hong-Kong amounted that year to \$65,332,554, while the total export trade from the United States to China amounted to the insignificant sum of \$4,482,457. Great Britain, in other words, exported thirteen times as much in 1878 to China as the United States did.

The little Kingdom of Belgium, with an area about equal to New Hampshire, buys of us in two years and a half as much as all China has done in the last twenty-four or twenty-five years.

The last report made by the State Department, and which has been printed, upon the commerce and navigation of the country for the year ending June 30, 1880, states that our export trade to China amounted in 1880 to \$1,101,315. Our export trade to China during six of the last ten years was less than it was in 1843, which was the year before the Cushing treaty was negotiated with that empire. During that year, 1843, our exports to that country amounted to \$1,755,393, and yet during six years of the last ten our exports have been less than in 1843; and our population at that time was only about one-third of what it now is.

In this statement I leave out of view the exportation of gold and silver bullion, and speak only of merchandise and manufactured articles.

The great amount of our trade with China is made up of imports from that country, and those are composed of tea and silk principally. They must have a market for their goods, and whether we pass this bill or not, whether we offend them or not, they are only

too glad to sell their products to us, and it will not interfere with that trade in any the least regard. We have an example to show us that it makes no difference so far as their commerce is concerned. Look at England. In 1860 it sent a fleet into her rivers to bombard her forts, and it invested the city of Peking and destroyed the Emperor's palace by fire. And yet that people which committed those outrages upon that sacred empire now control 60 per cent. of all her commerce with the world, while we, under the beneficent influence of our Burlingame treaty, exported to that Chinese Empire last year products to the amount of only \$1,101,315!

But, Mr. Speaker, even if our commerce were much larger than it is, if it did interfere with our commerce in the situation in which we find affairs upon the Pacific States, still we should take the step proposed by the pending legislation. Human happiness and civic concord are not to be weighed against commercial prosperity. A human soul is worth more than the bills of lading of the greatest steamship that ever crossed the sea. Again, it has been said their coming here will not degrade, but on the contrary will elevate our laborers, as our labor when driven out of other employment will seek higher and more remunerative work. I cannot see how that is to be accomplished. By the census of 1870 it appears there were in this country 2,033,000 laborers, men and women, engaged in manufactures.

Now, then, suppose this Chinese immigration is unrestricted; suppose that the citizens of that country were permitted to come here without limit and that this population would flow in here, as undoubtedly it would if there were no opposition to it, it lies in the nature of things, and in the relations of labor and social economy that it would drive out the laborers of our country. It would not elevate them, it could not do that. Where and how would they be elevated? Suppose that several thousands of those laborers were turned loose in Lawrence or Lowell, or other of our manufacturing cities, or amid the furnaces of Pittsburgh or Chicago, or the mines of Pennsylvania, how would that elevate the numbers of people whom you would throw out of employment in those places? Will they go to the learned professions? Will they become merchants, traders, or farmers? Where would they go? What elevation is to take place among them? I would like that to be clearly pointed out to me.

And, further, Mr. Speaker, in the census of 1870 it was shown that there were about two and a quarter millions of agricultural laborers in this country. Suppose this Chinese horde of immigrants should go upon the farms, and drive the hardy workingmen from their places, where would these agricultural laborers go to seek employment? Where would the elevation of the laborer take place? I would like some gentleman to explain it. Mr. Speaker, I look upon it as unnatural, as Utopian, to allege that there will be any elevation. The elevation would probably be to idleness or to the poor-house. The argument, such as it is, that it is necessary to bring here a pauper, and degraded labor, to bring here a cheap labor, is the very logic and reason which underlies the whole question of slavery itself. It should come simply to elevate the Caucasian. And labor should be made servile, tractable, docile as they say of labor in Singapore, in order to elevate and improve our own. But, Mr. Speaker, are we ready for that? I thought we had passed that era in our national life.

Last year there were about eight hundred thousand immigrants from Europe landed upon our shores. They were Scandinavians, Germans, Englishmen, and Irishmen, but they were people of our own blood and instincts. They have coalesced with our people; they have mingled in the vocations of life with our own citizens; they send their children to our schools; they worship in our churches; they sit upon our juries; they attend our town meetings; they read our newspapers, study our principles of government, and when the time of trial comes they carry our muskets and fight our battles. We and they might exclaim, when looking at our institutions and our flag, almost in the words the Laureate used when he welcomed to Old England the affianced bride of her eldest prince:

Saxons and Normans and Danes are we,
But all of us Danes in our love for thee.

Supposing that these Chinese immigrants, instead of being segregated, as they now are, were to come into the State of Ohio, or into the State of Massachusetts, or into any one of the Northern, Southern, or Eastern States, and begin to crowd upon the labor of their communities, do you not suppose that it would make a difference in the way the question is looked upon by statesmen here, or by the people of those States? If you transport into a manufacturing town in Massachusetts some four or five hundred of these laborers, where and upon what pinnacle will your four or five hundred displaced laborers find a resting-place? Where is the elevation they would seek? I would like to have it pointed out to me. If our labor cannot compete with theirs it is coolly stated here to be a proof of its inferiority. Not at all; it is not inferior. I believe in the survival of the fittest. We could subdue the Chinese Empire with its four or five hundred millions of inhabitants. Our fifty millions could conquer that vast empire with our bayonets and our guns. But they would as certainly subdue us in the field of labor, even as would a swarm of locusts or grasshoppers.

The very doctrine of the survival of the fittest is what leads us as intelligent men to do what is for our interests. We know we cannot

compete with such a class, and therefore, in the interest of our own people, we declare they should not come within our borders.

The Anglo-Saxon is a political animal trained to govern and to rule, and yet he only does one thing at a time, but he does it well. At one time it was the English barons struggling with King John, and they gained their point. At another time it was Cromwell and his Ironsides against Charles I, and they were triumphant. At another time in America in the interest of representation, and again they succeeded. Now, then, they have to solve a new problem. Having brought a continent under our dominion, we stand now at last face to face with an old and ancient and different civilization, one whose history runs so far back that no man can trace it. And during all the centuries of its existence it has not advanced a step, but seeks now to pour its millions of paupers into the lap of American civilization.

Now, as Anglo-Saxon legislators holding the mighty traditions of the past, we stand face to face with that question; and I believe we are competent to decide it and decide it right. Our civilization is growing more and more complex. It must be harmonious; it must work smoothly or it will certainly perish. Many questions of great importance press for solution. We have not yet begun to solve the labor question, that question which for fifty years or more has agitated the Kingdom of Great Britain and other countries. More and more has it troubled them. Such was the distress in England in the early part of this century that Malthus, a representative of the Christian civilization of Europe, in order to put a curb or a check upon multiplication of laborers beyond the means to employ them, enunciated a doctrine which is abhorrent to our feelings and against human nature itself. And now lately in the bills of Mr. Gladstone the acts regulating Irish matters it has been provided for the purpose of relieving laborers in Ireland that in certain cases emigration may be aided by the government itself. We know that in Ireland before the famine of 1846-'47 although wages were down to a starvation point, not one-half of the laborers there could receive any employment at all.

I speak of these things to show that this great question has been deemed the important question of modern civilization, and that it has not yet been decided. Five years have not yet rolled by since this country was convulsed by a labor movement which threatened a destruction of law and of authority in our midst and from ocean to ocean. Do we so soon forget it? It was the same labor question that underlay the question of slavery and brought on the war. And now it appears again in our midst, aggravated by this Chinese question. We do not see its evil effects now perhaps, because we have so much virgin territory to which laborers may go. But the time is coming and coming soon, if we increase as fast as we have done in the last ten years, when that state of things shall have passed by. When the next census is taken we will have 65,000,000 of people. In twenty years from now (when the limitation fixed by this bill shall have expired) we shall have 85,000,000 or 90,000,000 of people, and instead of emigration westward it will perhaps set eastward. Then, when our population has become much more dense, when its numbers shall have increased so that there is a surplus of laborers, as has always been the tendency in the older nations; when there shall be no outlet to new territories for the unemployed, thus reducing the glut of labor, then wages will fall as other commodities fall in a time of glut. Then we shall have to solve for ourselves this great problem which has perplexed England and other countries of the Old World so long, and which still perplexes them, and when it has got to that state then you will be face to face with the question, What are the natural and necessary wages of men? It has been laid down by great economists that it is the lowest amount a man and his family can live upon—that that is the natural and necessary measure of wages. Think of that abhorrent doctrine, and yet it is demonstrated by the principles of political economy.

Then is it not of importance and is it not our duty as members of this representative body to see to it that no law shall be passed which shall bring into competition with our people a body of laborers who can live on almost absolutely nothing? Our citizens require their houses to be carpeted; they require meat to eat; they require school-books for their children, and newspapers for themselves, and desire to be able to make contributions to their churches; they require a roof-tree and a cheerful fireside; they require a multiplicity of things for their health and prosperity. And upon such laborers and such homes, so dignified and so ennobled, our institutions rest. But the Chinaman requires nothing to wear hardly, and hardly anything to eat, and has no aspirations to gratify. He has no family to support. One small room will accommodate a score of them. They have no comprehension of the word home. And when that time of surplus labor comes, as it has come to all civilizations, the cupidity of man and the soullessness of corporations will force them to employ that labor which is the cheapest; and that must be the Chinese.

Mr. WHITE. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. SHERWIN. Not now.

Mr. WHITE. Did you ever see a Chinaman in this country that was not well dressed and that did not pay his debts?

Mr. COX, of New York. He wears his shirt outside of his pants. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHERWIN. I have not time to yield.

What do we most desire in this country? Certainly a happy, pros-

perous, progressive people, living under wise and beneficent laws. To build up such a society, such a nation, it must be composed of harmonious elements. Its people must have common hopes, common desires, and a common pride in our common country. The Chinese never could unite with us. This has been demonstrated wherever they have touched the Caucasian race; and when that is shown I think the question is really settled.

If I had time—but I have promised to yield some of it—I would read upon that point the opinions of men who have observed these people in different lands. I would recur also to the question of their religion and the possibility of Christianizing them and show that it never has been done. As the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. McLANE] related yesterday in illustration of this point, it seems that they never become Christians except under a pretense in order that they may make a little more money out of the Caucasians; and having made it they go back to their first estate. That is the universal testimony. Shall we embrace them because they belong to that society of which Confucius was once the head; that body of men that nearly two thousand years ago, as was told us yesterday by the gentleman from Iowa, [Mr. KASSON,] sent out the three wise men to the West looking for a new religion, that religion which we now venerate but which the descendants of Confucius revile and reject?

In this country all men have labored with their hands, if they do not now labor, and their children will labor after them. And I tell you this is a question which comes home after all to the men and women who labor with their hands, more than to any one else. And I think we can trust them in determining it better than we can trust any one else. A few years ago Mr. Gladstone said that in all the great questions which underlie the foundations of society the instincts, if I may use the term, of the common people was more to be relied upon than those of the higher classes. And that same doctrine has been enunciated by another writer in England who has explored all the sources of political power when he says no man or men by inspecting society can see what it most needs; society must be left to feel what it most needs.

The people of the Pacific coast have seen and felt what they need. They have declared it in California by the voices of 154,000 voters to less than 900. They tell us what they have seen and what they have felt. Shall we grant them relief, or when they ask for bread shall we give them a stone?

I believe that this House is ready to pass this bill; if not just as it stands, substantially as it stands, so as to check and suspend this immigration. I hope that it will do so. I hope that we shall be able to answer to our own consciences in this matter and to say to the people of this country that in passing this bill we have acted in accordance with the traditions of our civilization and the principles of the Constitution itself.

And if we do this, if we see to it that the pure bullion of a Christian Anglo-Saxon civilization is not debased by the alloy of effete orientalisms, it will be well for our society. If we do this the coming years will bring nothing but progress to us. We shall see happy homes springing up all over our land, and cheerful firesides everywhere; and there shall here arise a structure grander and more beautiful than the famed temple which crowned the Athenian Hill. Its foundations shall rest upon the enduring rock of a people's love. Its entablature will be sustained upon the arms of our country's manliest sons. Its sculptured friezes shall relate the matchless story of its progress, through years of toil and conflict, from strenuous youth to vigorous manhood and an honored and serene old age. This temple will defy the ravages of time, and standing in the genial atmosphere of our blessed land shall dominate the world by its beauty and its strength. [Applause.]

I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. HAZELTON.]

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. ALDRICH, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. No. 4440) to establish a railway bridge across the Mississippi River, extending from a point between Wabasha and Read's Landing, in Minnesota, to a point below the mouth of the Chippewa River, in Wisconsin.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. HAZLTON. Mr. Speaker, the landing of the cavaliers in Virginia and of the Pilgrim fathers at Plymouth Rock was the beginning of our distinctive nationality. Among the European races we had our origin and down through all the vicissitudes of our history and development as a free people, from them we have drawn an almost constant emigration, which has contributed always to our advancement in civil and religious liberty, because of a type of civilization kindred to our own. We have invited and welcomed its coming to our shores; and, whether voluntary or sought, it has come to us, transferring its allegiance from fatherland, from empire and throne, to the better government of liberty in the New World. It has come to adopt our language, to build and maintain homes like our own, and to share in the burdens as well as the privileges and immunities of free government. It has come as an ally of our civilization, as a compatriot in the sacred cause of liberty, as a collaborer in our moral,

intellectual, and material progress. It has come to help make our battle-fields illustrious and our victories secure, until, under a natural blending of the old into the new life, the national domain extends from ocean to ocean, and the population of the Republic has increased from three to fifty millions of people, prosperous, united, homogeneous, and free. And in all this inpouring of the humanity of the Old World into our own Europe has lost and we have gained the best material she has produced for the formation and maintenance of free and enlightened government. From this source we have never anticipated or incurred danger to our free institutions.

EMIGRATION MUST BE HOMOGENEOUS.

The victories of the Mexican war carried our empire and national jurisdiction to the shores of the Pacific Ocean, into new fields for enterprise, and there to confront the incoming of a race entirely different from all those who have come to us through the eastern gates of the Republic.

I cannot understand how we as a nation can have any interest in the encouragement of immigration to our shores from any direction whatsoever only as it can be made to contribute to our strength as a people engaged in working out the great problem of human liberty under a republican form of government. And in the prosecution of this mighty enterprise can we assume that all the antagonisms of all the races upon the globe can be blended into one harmonious whole under our Government? That the Republic can draw into its bosom all the poisons that have been generated by mankind since history began and not imperil its existence?

THE CHINESE COOLY SYSTEM A FORM OF SERVILE LABOR.

The great law of self-defense applies as much to the cause of liberty as to the individual, and an appeal to history will verify the assertion.

It is from this point of view that we are compelled to consider prudently and well how and to what extent our existence as a free nation is to be affected by a constant influx of Chinese coolies upon the Pacific shores. This class of laborers had been transported in large numbers to California before the Burlingame treaty of 1868 was negotiated and ratified. They were not brought there for the purpose of becoming citizens of the Republic, nor did they themselves intend to become citizens of the Republic, nor did the Chinese Government intend that they should, for it demanded and obtained a guarantee that nothing in the treaty should be held to confer naturalization upon the subjects of China in the United States. Their coming was not voluntary, nor was it immigration in any sense of the word. It was, on the contrary, a deportation of the lowest class of Chinese servile laborers in herds from an overcrowded district, transported to our coast under contract for the benefit of speculators as base as the promoters of the African slave trade, to whom they were bound to pay tribute during their entire existence in this country.

AMERICAN LABOR DENOUNCES THE COOLY SYSTEM.

And now let me read one short paragraph from the Annual Cyclopaedia for 1871, to show the estimate which the State of Massachusetts put on this Chinese immigration in their great labor convention and in a platform supported by so great a philanthropist as Wendell Phillips. They made this declaration and protest against this very class of immigration:

Viewing the contract importation of coolies as only another form of the slave trade, we demand that contracts made relative thereto be void in this country, and that no public ship and no steamship which receives public subsidy shall aid in such importation.

THE BURLINGAME TREATY DID NOT INCLUDE COOLY IMMIGRATION.

This inhuman traffic was the source of great anxiety to Mr. Burlingame, the devoted friend of both countries, and he made a manly effort to correct it in the treaty which bears his name. The treaty says, "the high contracting parties, therefore, join in reprobating any other than an entirely voluntary emigration," and they joined as well in a solemn stipulation for the passage of the laws to punish the taking of Chinese citizens to this or any other country without "their free and voluntary consent." That treaty was negotiated as far back as 1868 and Burlingame has gone down to his grave, but the great evil condemned by the treaty and by him still remains unabated. "The voluntary emigration" still lingers in the Celestial Kingdom. All labor still comes from the ports of China as it came before the Burlingame treaty, and wears the same degrading chain clanking upon its limbs. The base importer still fattens upon his cooly traffic, while free citizen labor in the fair States of the Pacific languishes and is menaced with degradation or destruction.

CHINA HAS NOT FULFILLED HER TREATY STIPULATIONS.

We have a right to demand what is denominated in the treaty bond with China. We have kept faith upon all its provisions; she has not kept hers. Every cooly importation from China to our shores is an open and flagrant violation of the Burlingame treaty. Not a Chinese laborer has come through the Golden Gate to the Pacific shore of the class and character contemplated by the treaty. The great evil she reprobated in treaty she has fostered in practice. We summon her now to the execution of her joint covenants with the United States in the passage of laws which shall end this great crime against humanity and sweep it from the commerce of the seas. And the answer is not a denial of broken obligations under an existing treaty of peace and friendship, but she pleads a new one, executed at Peking

November 17, 1880, extending new powers and practically conferring upon us all power and all responsibility over this question.

AMERICA CAN REGULATE COOLY IMMIGRATION.

The important duty assigned to diplomacy has been discharged thoroughly and well, and now the responsibility of the execution of this power to "regulate, limit, or suspend" the coming of Chinese laborers in the future rests with the American Congress. The extent and meaning of this power conferred upon us by the Chinese Government by virtue of this solemn treaty stipulation puts the whole controversy, in all its length and breadth, substantially into our hands and under our control.

Under the very language of this treaty stipulation we may invoke the power of legislation whenever in our opinion a necessity for it exists, and there is no limitation upon that power reserved except that it may not extend to an absolute prohibition of the "coming of Chinese laborers" to our shores. One thing is clear to me, and that is that we ought to make provisions for enfranchisement or proceed at once to the vigorous enforcement of the treaty power by Congressional enactment.

IF THE COOLY IS FIT TO BE AN AMERICAN CITIZEN THIS BILL IS WRONG—A REPLY TO MR. KASSON.

If I believed for one moment, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KASSON] professes to believe, and as he has declared his political belief on this question to be, so help me God, standing in this Capitol of the free, under my oath as a member of this Congress under the Constitution, my right arm should wither before I would vote for anything else than a law that should enfranchise a race to which I paid the tribute that he paid on this floor. There is no consistency in the position taken by any man that this race is fit for enfranchisement in this nation, and yet to vote for one moment's suspension of their coming to this country. The magnitude of the subject will admit of no uncertain policy. Let us deal with the great question plainly and directly. No man can defend the proposition for a moment that it is for our interest or theirs to retain within the body of our people a hundred and fifty thousand serfs, to be increased constantly and indefinitely from the overcrowded millions of the Chinese Empire.

NO ROOM FOR SERVILE LABOR.

There is no room under our flag or within the proud ranks of American labor for the vassals of a foreign government. And I do not believe, sir, that we can continue this ever-enlarging system of serf labor for any great length of time, bearing none of the burdens of Government, and yet so far under its aegis as to rob American labor of its just rewards, without awakening a conflict between the two forces as they approach each other nearer and nearer, in which one or the other must give way and perish. There must always be from the very nature of things an eternal conflict between two such internal forces, the one the foundation and pillar of our strength, the other repugnant to all our history, traditions, and the letter of our Constitution. We lifted a race from the broken manacle to the highest sovereignty on earth when we gave it the ballot, and we did it under an exigency forced upon us by war, and we did it because we knew that a race that had been born and continued on our soil for a hundred years must remain, and to be free must be enfranchised.

IMMIGRANTS MUST BE CITIZENS.

And we have at length fixed it as one of the fundamental rights of our Government that he who is worthy of being ranked with American labor shall be a citizen of the Republic.

"Why, in the elder day to be a Roman was greater than a king;" so here in our day to be an American is greater than a king, and it is because we have no civic wreath richer than that which we place upon the brow of American labor.

COOLY IMMIGRATION MUST CEASE.

Now, sir, the friends of this measure have no disposition to disguise its purposes. It means to suspend and practically extinguish the future coming of Chinese coolies to the United States. It means that cooly traffic upon the high seas between the ports of China and the Pacific coast shall cease. It means that the United States is not yet ready to confer citizenship upon Chinese coolies.

THE AMERICAN HOME MUST NOT BE IMPERILED.

It means that our system of free labor, dignified and honorable, which maintains the sacred family relation, the hearthstone, and the home, the school-house and the church; which answers cheerfully every demand that society and government makes upon it in peace and war shall not be struck down or impaired by a competition that pays no tribute toward the support of any one of these great elements of strength and virtue; that it must be worthy of and conform to the requirements of American labor before it can be admitted to its fellowship. It means all this, but it means no invasion upon the provisions of the new treaty; all its reservations are carefully recognized, preserved, and respected.

THIS BILL NOT IN CONFLICT WITH OUR TREATY.

I defy any man on this floor to take this treaty, which consists practically of three articles, couched in plain and simple language as it is, and show us that this bill is in conflict with it.

The first article of the treaty gives us the power to suspend this immigration. The second article protects the laborers that are now here, giving them the right to go and come at will. The third article

reserves all the rights there were under the old treaty, which is still in existence, leaving this only as a modification of it.

Some gentleman says that the sixteenth section of this bill is objectionable because it strikes down enfranchisement. Sir, the treaty provides that these people are to have the rights, privileges, and immunities of the most favored nation. But that declaration is to be considered in the light of that provision of the Burlingame treaty which says that while they are to have these privileges the United States is especially enjoined not to conclude from anything therein said that she can enfranchise the subjects of China.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WASHBURN. I ask consent that the time of the gentleman be extended.

There was no objection.

NO MIDDLE GROUND.

Mr. HAZELTON. Mr. Speaker, it is argued against this measure that it is not in accord with the interest of Christianity, that it is not in accord with our traditions and policy in conferring citizenship upon the subjects of foreign powers, that twenty years' suspension of the coming of Chinese laborers is an unreasonable length of time and will work hardships not contemplated by the treaty.

I would not willingly disregard the will of the American people upon any one of these points. I would not stand in the way of the onward march of Christianity anywhere, but if we are satisfied that they, the American people, have determined that this foreign element is incapable of becoming a safe and consistent part of our civilization as citizens, then we should fix such a term of suspension as shall clearly indicate that determination. That is fair to China, to ourselves, and to the world.

Then, why talk of a suspension of two or three or ten or twenty years? You gentlemen who would write ten years in the bill can make no reservations before the American people on this question. If I had not made up my mind in favor of this policy I would not vote for an hour's suspension. But having so made up my mind I will vote for ten, fifteen, or twenty years, if necessary, in order to enforce it; and it is, in my opinion, the only consistent position which any man can occupy on this question. I see no middle ground here upon which to stand.

CHINA UNDERSTOOD THE TREATY.

Do you believe, sir, that China did not understand the full import and meaning of this treaty stipulation; that she did not understand the purpose for which it was sought; that it was a radical change of the policy contained in the Burlingame treaty, and an absolute abandonment of every principle and almost every privilege extended by us for all time to our European immigration? This new policy exacted by us is an insulting insinuation to China unless we move on to its reasonable execution. She had the opportunity to limit the period of suspension by the treaty. She did not suggest it even. She well knew that the power granted by the first article of the treaty, if enforced by legislation, would constitute a substantial barricade to the corrupt current of cooly immigration, and having conceded this, she must concede all that is necessary to enforce it.

NO INIMICAL FEELING AGAINST CHINA.

Taking China by the hand in the name of peace and friendship we frankly and honestly stated to her, We are dissatisfied with the class of laborers that come from you to us, and with the manner of their coming. They are not such as we expected under the Burlingame treaty. We believe that their coming affects the interests and endangers the good order of our country, and especially of certain localities in the States of the Pacific. We are convinced that we cannot safely make these subjects of yours citizens of the Republic, and we deprecate their presence and increase as serfs.

Now, if we mean what we said to the Chinese Emperor, a period of twenty years' suspension can hardly be regarded as an extravagant measure of the new policy inaugurated by the treaty. Will a period less than this quiet agitation on this great leading question of the country, inspire hope and faith in the heart of American labor, and afford to ourselves and the world a just and fair test of the wisdom of this new policy?

AMERICANS HAVE DECIDED CONVICTIONS.

Standing, as I believe a majority of the American Congress does, upon the provisions of this bill substantially as they are, we are not, in my humble judgment, in advance of the sentiment of the American people. The President recognized this fact in his message to Congress. The two great political organizations which compass the political power of this country have recognized it in the platforms of their political faith. I remember well, sir, the occasion and the hour when, in the face of this sentiment cherished by the American people as an abiding conviction, our noble candidate for the Presidency trembled, like Belshazzar at the writing on the wall, as infamous forgery attempted to betray his sentiments and pledges on this great question.

Now, sir, I am not dealing with this question within the walls of the Chinese Empire. I am not studying Confucius for light on this subject.

CHINESE CIVILIZATION IS NOT OUR CIVILIZATION.

I am not inquiring how many different kinds of gods the inventive genius of Chinese idolatry has created. I know this, however, that

Chinese civilization has drawn more from the darkness of the mediaeval ages than from the light of the nineteenth century; and I know that if the segment of her population now upon the Pacific shores is the standard and measure of her home civilization, it is of the lowest order. Go to California and study it as it appears there, in all its phases; consider this question as it confronts you at home, not in China.

THE MONSTROSITY OF THE COOLY LABOR SYSTEM.

This system of labor that now darkens the fair lands of the Pacific coast embraces 150,000 coolies. It embraces an adult male population equal to more than one-third of the entire voting power of that State. It lives in herds and sleeps like packs of dogs in kennels. It subsists on loathsome food, and all the methods of its living are revolting to human nature. It is a monstrosity whose touch blasts our civic virtues and paralyzes our system of labor. It has been there thirty years and more, and Christianity has not yet pierced the walls of its heathen superstitions or removed a pagan god from its altars. A hundred and fifty thousand of them swarm the Pacific coast, equal in number to the population of Dakota, that now asks admission as a State in the American Union; and yet in all this number and in all these years they have not yet established one family home of a type known to our civilization.

THE CHINESE COOLY DOES NOT KNOW OUR HOME.

The grandest institution we have in all our civilization is totally disregarded and unknown to them. The corner-stone upon which our fathers builded and upon which our whole fabric of free government rests they reject. Who can measure the influence of the homes of New England in the last hundred years upon the civilization of our country and the world? Where does liberty find the sources of her strength but in the homes of America? We want no element of humanity added to our own that does not recognize its importance and that will not maintain and defend it to the last. The sweetest picture that Tennyson hung upon the walls of his Palace of Art was of an English home:

An English home—gray twilight poured
On dewy pastures, dewy trees
Softer than sleep—all things in order stored;
A haunt of ancient peace.

WE WILL LOSE NOTHING BY SUSPENDING COOLY IMPORTATION.

And now, sir, viewing this question in all its relations to ourselves as a nation and to the world, I believe that it is to the advantage of all concerned that the problem before us be speedily solved. Let the future coming of Chinese laborers be suspended under the operations of this act, and let those who are now here, unless time and experience shall prove them worthy of citizenship, quietly and without violence melt away. Christianity will lose nothing by the result. None of her rights and privileges have been impaired by the new treaty, or will be by the provisions of this enactment.

Commerce will lose nothing. China is as much interested in its maintenance and increase with us as are we with her, and more. Freedom will lose nothing. She never has built and never can build her empire upon a humanity whose god is a graven image, and whose impulses, sentiments, and fixed methods of life are hostile to the world's highest and best civilization.

THE CHINESE COOLIES ARE NOT REAL AMERICAN LABORERS.

Those of us who entertain the tender sentiment that our land should be made an asylum for all races of mankind, whether worthy or unworthy, whether of the same parent stock or of one entirely foreign to it, cannot appreciate the anxiety of the people of the Pacific coast to have this problem settled in favor of the American system of labor. They would better appreciate it if the same relative number of Chinese coolies were placed in the States of the East in competition with their own artisans and miners, their own farm and railroad laborers, men whose brawny arms gain food and homes for wives and children, and from whose ranks come many of our greatest statesmen, many of the chieftains of our victorious armies, many of the teachers of our religion, many of the tireless men of the press, who largely contribute to all that adorns our humanity and strengthens our national existence, then would they know the significance of this great labor problem as the people of the far West know it.

LIBERTY AND LABOR ARE INSEPARABLE ALLIES.

Under our Government liberty and labor are inseparable allies, and whatever saps the one destroys the other. And now, while I would not deny to any of God's creatures on this broad earth the boon of our freedom who are worthy of it and who can be made a sustaining part of it, still I have learned to believe in the light of its great struggles in the past that eternal vigilance is its price and its security. I have seen it in my day and generation pass within the shadows of a revolution over the result of a national election which threatened its very existence. I know it can never pass such another ordeal without a shock that shall be felt throughout the universe itself. I know how much it cost and how precious it is, and I would not barter it or impair it for all the wealth and all the races of the Orient.

Mr. PACHECO obtained the floor.

TAXATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. NEAL. Will the gentleman from California [Mr. PACHECO] yield to me to make a report from the Committee on the District of Columbia?

Mr. PACHECO. Yes, sir.

Mr. NEAL, by unanimous consent, reported back from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments the bill (H. R. No. 5031) for the assessment and collection of taxes and licenses in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

BRIDGES ACROSS THE OHIO RIVER.

Mr. TOWNSEND, of Ohio, by unanimous consent, reported from the Committee on Commerce, as a substitute for House bill No. 204, a bill (H. R. No. 5380) supplementary to an act approved December 17, 1872, entitled "An act to authorize the construction of bridges across the Ohio River and to prescribe the dimensions of the same;" which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House, by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the bill (H. R. No. 4439) to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States establishing the times, places, and provisions for holding terms of the district and circuit courts in the northern district of New York.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

The House resumed the consideration of the bill (S. No. 71) to enforce treaty stipulations relating to Chinese.

Mr. PACHECO. Mr. Speaker, some doubts have been expressed on this floor as to whether the better classes of people in California or on the Pacific slope are in favor of the anti-Chinese movement or of the bill now under consideration. I submit at this time an extract from one of our leading papers, the San Francisco Post, giving an account of the anti-Chinese demonstration in San Francisco. I ask the Clerk to read this as a preamble to the remarks which I am about to make.

The Clerk read as follows:

Last Saturday's anti-Chinese demonstration was eminently successful. There was an all-pervading earnestness of purpose, an unanimity of opinion, and a seriousness of demeanor visible such as never before characterized any public gathering in this city. The atmosphere appeared to be laden with the importance and gravity of the situation. There was a total absence of passion or noisy demonstration on the part of the vast multitudes of men who thronged the streets, for few women were abroad. Order, quiet, and sobriety prevailed throughout the day. Strangers from the East, or from any foreign country, who chanced to be in San Francisco last Saturday looked in vain for the proverbial hoodlum. He was not in the streets, nor did he mingle even silently with the masses who constituted the meetings in hall and thoroughfare. The best and most intelligent of San Francisco citizens were present at those gatherings; and they represented the moral force, the home life and religious sentiment of this great city. This fact should be conveyed to the East, because it is a conclusive answer to the flippant utterances so frequently made by a section of the eastern press and pulpit in reference to California's real opinion on the Chinese question. We do not doubt for a moment the sense of justice and fair play of our fellow-citizens in the East when they understand the real facts; but the truth has been so persistently perverted by lay and clerical agencies working in the interest of Joss and cheap labor, that an erroneous opinion has been created in that section of the Union. The indications now tend to show that these misrepresentations no longer obscure the mental vision of eastern men. Light is breaking, and the day of California's deliverance from a worse than Egyptian bondage is at hand. Leading newspapers in New York and other great cities recognize the justice of our demand. The United States Senate admits that California has a right to redress of grievances, and that no commonwealth of the Union should be injured by persistence in a particular line of foreign policy founded upon mere sentiment. Saturday's demonstration will strengthen the feeling-East favorable to restriction of Chinese labor. For not alone has San Francisco spoken. The entire State echoed the resolutions adopted by the meeting in this city. Meetings were held in every important center of population in California, at which resolutions condemnatory of Chinese immigration were adopted. The sister State of Nevada also wheeled into line and sent its voice thundering along the wires to Washington.

Mr. PACHECO. The subject of Chinese immigration has been so thoroughly and so ably discussed by the gentlemen who have preceded me that it is scarcely possible to urge any reason for the passage of the bill that has not already been put forth both in the Senate and upon this floor. Yet, the subject is of such vital importance to this country, and especially to the Pacific coast, that I should fail in my duty did I not earnestly advocate its passage and state my reasons for doing so. To appreciate to its full extent the importance of this question, it is necessary to come into daily contact with it, as we in the Pacific States do. It is necessary to see with our own eyes the insidious encroachments of the Mongolian upon every branch of labor, every avenue of industry, to know of our own knowledge that they are taking in our factories and workshops, at the plow, beside the loom, yea, in our very kitchens and laundries, the place of the white laborer. And why? Because this alien race, inured through long generations past to hardship, to meager and unsubstantial food, to privations of every kind, would thrive and fatten where the white man would starve. It has been stated by some of the opponents of this bill that the Chinese ask and obtain very nearly the same rate of wages as that demanded by the Caucasian laborer. The simple fact is this: were the white man to demand a dollar a day, the Chinaman would be content with ninety cents per diem, or just so much less as would enable him to underbid his competitor. The Caucasian laborer cannot compete successfully with the Mongolian for many reasons. He would turn with loathing from the offal and refuse food upon which the Chinese cooly would subsist if necessary,

he either has, or aspires to have, a home blessed and brightened by the presence of wife and child; for those he loves, he craves proper food, shelter, and raiment; he identifies himself with the country which becomes his home; in time he is part and parcel of it, has a voice in its government, and if necessary sheds his life-blood in its defense!

As a people we are composed chiefly of the best of European immigrants and their descendants. Our language is the same, our forms of worship are similar, and we are governed by the same laws. The models upon which our institutions are formed are the best which the world has known, and we live in an age and under conditions which will measure the possibilities of human excellence and sound the depths and resources of the human mind. In brief, being what we now are, if we retain intact the rich inheritance our fathers have bequeathed us, and build upon the plan of which they have laid the solid foundations, we shall attain the fruits of the highest and best civilization which the world has yet seen.

Let us compare with this

Latest seed of Time

the Mongolian, his successful competitor in almost every field of labor in the Pacific States. He represents the oldest nation upon the face of the earth; his history, his habits and customs, his arts and sciences are what they were countless generations ago, and he is now what he will be in centuries to come—unchanged, unchangeable, fixed, immovable as the decrees of fate.

By the laws of heredity the habits of his ancestors live in his character and are incorporated into his blood and brain. With the Chinaman of to-day the great question is of mere subsistence. The same fierce struggle which has engaged his ancestors for centuries engages him now. He has known only the most pinching poverty and expects nothing else. His religion, if religion it may be called, is worship of the gods which are the work of his own hands. Family ties and obligations and the sweets of home life are naught to him. The long course of training which has gone on for so many generations has made of the Chinaman a lithe, sinewy creature, with muscles like iron, and almost devoid of nerves and sensibilities. His ancestors have also bequeathed to him the most hideous immoralities. They are as natural to him as the yellow hue of his skin, and are so shocking and horrible that their character cannot even be hinted. This is the testimony of several well-known writers, as well as the opinion of every people where this race has migrated.

This is a hasty picture of what they are in their native land, and I will now endeavor to briefly outline the conditions under which they are brought to our shores. It is a well-known fact that they do not come of their own volition, but are brought here like droves of cattle, with their labor sold in advance. This traffic in human flesh is in some respects more hideous than the African slave trade, and will, if it be not suppressed, bring results even more far-reaching and disastrous. And why? Because among this vast horde of swarthy people are no families—no wives and children—save in the very rarest cases. According to a recent estimate out of about one hundred thousand Chinese there are not more than six thousand women. And they, alas! are in a state of the most abject bondage, and are brought for purposes of prostitution.

Upon this point I will quote the words of Rev. Mr. Gibson, a well-known Chinese missionary. He says:

More than nine-tenths have been sold into a hopeless bondage worse than death. The women are bought in China and shipped across the ocean to this Christian land to be sold again to minister to the lusts of wicked men for the profit of their more wicked masters.

The imagination shrinks back appalled at the thought of the morals of a hundred thousand men without families.

In Chinatown, a section of the city of San Francisco, may be seen a fair sample of the lives these strange people lead in their own land. Were our authorities not to preserve at great expense and difficulty something like cleanliness there, the filth and stench would be intolerable. As it is, the respectable portion of the white population avoid that quarter of the city as they would a pestilence, and the sights and sounds which greet the eye and ear of the stranger, who by chance or design invades its precincts, are ever after recalled with horror and disgust. Foul and loathsome diseases, among which may be named small-pox and leprosy, have their breeding-place there, and it is a well-known fact that two or three epidemics of the former-named disease have been traced to these nests of contagion. So much for their morals, their habits of life, their haunts. And now a few words as to the effect of their presence in our midst. When the Chinese cooly comes to our shores he brings with him his religion, his laws, his manners and customs, his clothing, and in great part his food. He neither intends nor wishes to take root in our soil. He is among us but not of us. With his silent automaton-like industry he soon insinuates himself into every department of labor, and underbidding, if by ever so little, the white man, lives, like the parasite he is, upon the decay he causes. His earnings are carefully hoarded and sent back to China, to which country even his bones are returned after his death. Instead of increasing he lessens the resources of our country. Instead of building up he tears down. Being in our midst he invades and destroys our industries; he absorbs from us all he can, and in return invites us to share only his vices.

Is it a people like this we should affiliate with? No! a thousand times no!

I will now quote a few words from the recent message of Mayor Blake, of San Francisco, to the board of supervisors of that city. They are these:

As the Chinese quarter in San Francisco is China on a small scale, so will California be a large Chinatown as soon as the majority of its inhabitants are Chinamen—an event, in the absence of proper prohibitory legislation, neither impossible nor improbable. It has been and is the policy of this country to invite immigration, but the immigrants that we have invited and do invite have become American in ideas and American in sympathies, and with every disposition to add to the wealth and greatness of our common country. But it has not been and cannot be the policy of any country to invite within its boundaries a population that will always remain distinct and alien—alien in thoughts, habits, customs, and allegiance; a population at all times a source of general annoyance, irritation, and agitation, and in war a source of great weakness and danger, as all history shows that such a population is.

The presence of the Chinaman has procured the discharge of thousands of white laborers, who, with indifferent success, struggle to establish other employment, obtain other work. Around them they see the constantly lessening value of their property, which finally is swept away to satisfy the mortgage they have been compelled to put upon it. What was at first mere discontent becomes in course of time violent anger or sullen despair. We have seen the effect of discontented labor in the revolutions which have swept over the face of France; see it now in unhappy Russia, in suffering, poverty-stricken Ireland. God forbid that we should ever see a like effect in our own land. The appeal which California makes to Congress for help in this juncture is not an appeal made by those of another race, with other habits and customs, other views than those held by the members of this body. It is a cry for aid which one brother may make to another. North, South, East, and West each contributed her quota to swell the number of brave, enterprising spirits who thirty-odd years ago, sought the golden land of promise.

Speaking the same tongue, animated by the same desire, the magic word "home" striking the same chord in the hearts of all, they seemed almost to belong to one family; and as years rolled on and bright young faces clustered about the hearth-stones of California homes, the bond which linked them together and to parents and birth-place grew not weaker but stronger with time. I fancy there are few, if any, here to-day unconnected with California either by blood or sympathy. Do you not see the situation in which your brother or friend is placed? Is not his need your need? Will you not remedy the wrong he suffers? When our great civil war broke out and ravaged and desolated the land, though the Pacific States were far removed from the scene of strife, were they slow to offer their aid? Did not their wisest and bravest and best fight and bleed in the cause? And will you not respond to the appeal for help which now comes to you from them? They ask not for an armed force to repel the enemy within their borders, not that blood may be shed in their defense, not even that you shall turn away the devastating horde now defacing and blighting the fair land which they regarded as the heritage of their children. They ask merely that the evil already done them shall be restricted to its present proportions, that the mongrel race, ready to swoop down upon them in countless numbers, shall not be permitted to make of earth's garden spot a dreary wilderness, and of our white brethren homeless, famishing outcasts.

In conclusion I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if we can afford to degrade the American laborer to the level of the Chinese cooly? Can we afford to ask him to renounce home, wife, and child, the religion of his fathers, the love of his country and her institutions—all he holds most dear, all that makes him what he is?

This he must do if he would meet the Chinaman on equal grounds, would compete successfully with him in the field of labor. In short, he must substitute for his own the character which has come down to the Mongolian from time immemorial. I, for one, am opposed to this. I would uphold the dignity of the American laborer. I believe a blow struck at him would be a blow struck at our institutions, our religion, our Government—liberty itself.

In my opinion government exists for the protection of the men who instituted and sustain it. In my opinion the evil we have been discussing should be suppressed without delay. We can control it now, but in a short time it might control us.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the passage of this bill. I am in favor of having in our midst only those who are capable of assimilation with us, who in time of peace or war are prepared to share our burdens.

[During the delivery of the foregoing remarks, when the hour of two o'clock arrived,

Mr. WHITE said: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order. Yesterday, before the House adjourned—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WHITE] make any point of order against the gentleman from California, [Mr. PACHECO]?

Mr. WHITE. I do. I make the point that the time has now come when the previous question under the order of the House is to be considered as operating.

Mr. SPRINGER. We did not agree to anything of that kind.

Mr. WHITE. I will read from the RECORD.

Mr. SPRINGER. Objection was made, as the gentleman will see, at a later stage of the proceedings.

Mr. WHITE. I rise also to a question of personal privilege which is that if we are to violate the order of the House and extend this discussion beyond two o'clock—

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. There was a request for unanimous consent, but—

Mr. WHITE. I refer to page 2176 of the RECORD, about the middle of the page.

Mr. PAGE. I hope the gentleman from Kentucky will not take up the time of my colleague. There was no arrangement made; I only gave notice.

The SPEAKER. A notice was given by the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOOKER. I hope the gentleman from California [Mr. PACHECO] will not be interrupted.

Mr. WHITE. Do I understand that no order was made for the closing of debate at two o'clock?

The SPEAKER. None, as the Chair is advised.

Mr. WHITE. Very well, sir; then I yield the floor; but I understood that the debate was to close at two o'clock, and that thus the rest of us would be cut off. I merely wanted the order of the House enforced.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California will proceed.]

Mr. PACHECO yielded twenty minutes to Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the short time allotted to me I shall not have the opportunity to review the history of races and of nations, as has been done by my eloquent friend from Mississippi, [Mr. HOOKER.] I will say to him, however, in passing, that this measure does not involve the question of planting the Cross in a heathen land or erecting the standard of liberty under the shadow of despotism in China; it more nearly concerns the establishment of Chinese pagodas upon the ruins of the Cross in our own land, and the danger of subversion of our republican institutions by the despotism of China.

Neither will I consume time in criticising the æsthetical views of the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. TAYLOR,] or the transcendentalism of the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. RICE.]

This is a question which should be considered from the highest plane of statesmanship and patriotism, aside from partisan feeling or sordid motives. But, sir, several of the gentlemen upon the opposite side of this House have made use of this discussion to serve political ends and inveigh the Democratic party. They have unfairly and incorrectly stated the past action of political parties upon this question. As no one on this side has replied to these criticisms I have sought the floor in the closing hours of the debate for the purpose of more accurately defining the position of the two principal political parties with reference to Chinese immigration and the protection of American labor.

THIS IS A DEMOCRATIC MEASURE.

Mr. Speaker, this is in fact a Democratic measure. If it becomes a law, thanks will be due to the Democrats of the Senate and House of Representatives and a minority of Republicans in both Houses. If you will scan the history of the legislation of Congress regarding this subject, you will discover that the first Congressional action for protection against the importation of coolies from China, and for the relief of the laboring classes in California as well as elsewhere in this land, was originated and secured by the Democratic party in the lower House of Congress.

HISTORY OF LEGISLATION AGAINST IMPORTATION OF COOLIES.

When, sir, all other means had been ineffectual to restrain the introduction of Chinese cheap labor, threatening as it did the prosperity, the morals, and the social order of the communities on the Pacific coast, when all local efforts had proven ineffectual, the people of the Pacific slope turned to the American Congress and appealed for relief.

In 1869 there was a Republican majority in both Houses of Congress, and a Republican President presided over the destinies of this country. An appeal was made to that, the Forty-first Congress. How was it answered? The Republican party turned their back upon the pathetic appeal of the people of California. It was renewed to the Forty-second Congress, which was likewise Republican. Numerous memorials, resolutions of public meetings, petitions, one containing over 16,000 signatures, were presented, but they were all ignored. The people of the Pacific States appealed to the Forty-third, another Republican Congress, and again relief was refused. It was not until a Democratic House assembled here for the first time since the war that the grievances of the people found a hearing. It was in the first session of the Forty-fourth Congress that a joint resolution was adopted authorizing the President of the United States to open negotiations with the Chinese Government for the purpose of modifying the treaty between the two countries and restricting immigration from China to commercial purposes. That action was followed up in the second session of that Congress by a joint resolution requesting the President to present to the Chinese Government an additional article to the treaty for the accomplishment of that end. The Democratic House in the Forty-fifth Congress passed the "fifteen-passenger Chinese bill." It commanded the support of my friend from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER] as well as an overwhelming majority of the Democrats of this House. On the passage of that bill 110 Democrats voted in favor of it, and only 45 Republican members could be found on this floor who were willing to stand up with the friends of American labor. Only 9 Demo-

cratic members voted against that bill, while 63 Republicans voted in opposition to it.

What became of the bill? It afterward passed the Senate and was placed before the Republican President, who had it in his power by a stroke of his pen to make it the law of the land. What did he do with it? He vetoed it, and our efforts were in vain and the hopes of the people were disappointed. Now, this bill has come to us from the Senate, and if you will analyze the vote in that body upon its passage you will find that among all who voted against it there was but one Democratic Senator, and of those who voted for it there were but eight Senators on the Republican side; of those Republican Senators who favored the bill there were but two of them who did not come from the Pacific slope. So, then, Mr. Speaker, the evidence discloses the fact that this is in reality a Democratic measure.

POSITION OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOORE] had the candor the other day to acknowledge it, for he declared:

And I confess to utter incapacity to see how we on this side of the House can reconcile a vote for this dangerous bill with any principle of Republican consistency.

I think my friend has truthfully defined the true position of his party, and has reached a conclusion warranted by the past action and the principles of the Republican party. Doubtless, because of the Democratic character of this bill, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WILLIAMS] said:

My sentiments in regard to this bill compel me to express the hope that as one President vetoed the other, so may another President veto this.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the prayer of that gentleman may not prove to be a prophecy.

CAUSE OF POLITICAL CHANGE IN CALIFORNIA.

Various reasons have been assigned by our Republican friends for the political revolution which occurred in California last year. Some gentlemen have said it was owing to the Morey letter. How could the Morey letter have effected the result in California? The genuineness of it was denied publicly over the signature of the alleged author of it weeks before the election, and every intelligent voter must have known it was branded as a forgery before he cast his ballot.

THE MOREY LETTER.

The Morey letter, however, doubtless had influence on the election in California. And why? Because it was no doubt believed by the people of that State, judging the Republican party by its past hostility to any effort to restrain or prevent this immigration, that notwithstanding it was a forgery as regards General Garfield, yet that letter photographed the sentiment of the dominating influence in the Republican party. The gentleman from California, [Mr. PAGE,] whom I believe to be a sincere and earnest friend of the bill, and who deserves commendation for his energy and efforts in its behalf, could not sit still when he found among some of the ablest and most influential of his Republican friends advocates on this floor of the principles announced in the Morey letter.

When the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. WILLIAMS,] whose position as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs gives him great influence with his party, was speaking, my friend from California [Mr. PAGE] charged him to his teeth that he was advocating the principles of the Morey letter, and that gentleman did not deny the charge, but simply said he would allow his own speech to go upon the record beside the Morey letter, and in that connection used the following harsh language relative to the people of California:

My speech will stand in the RECORD, and let gentlemen and the country judge whether California was justified in her blind, must I say bigoted, prejudice to strike down the best defenders of labor and freedom in this country on the mere impulse of the hour. [Applause.]

This is a verbatim quotation from his speech as it appears in the RECORD, "applause" and all. It must not be forgotten, however, that the "applause" came exclusively from Republican members who opposed this bill. The country will judge him as my friend from California did, that he was the advocate of the principles of that letter, or rather that the logic of his argument was practically the same as the logic of the Morey letter.

My friend who represents the district that was formerly represented by the late President took a position with reference to Chinese immigration which had been advocated by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. RICE] and, as I have stated, by the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. WILLIAMS,] and which has been so forcibly branded by the gentleman from California as being in accordance with the principles and the logic of the Morey letter.

But, lest I may be charged with exaggeration, I will quote the language of the gentleman from California [Mr. PAGE] in the speech with which he opened this debate. It is as follows:

And what was it made the country think that letter was so infamous? What is in the letter but what is advocated by every man who is in favor of Chinese immigration into this country? The sentiments expressed in the "Morey letter" are absolutely and unqualifiedly the sentiments of those who believe that it is right to bring here millions of cool slaves that their labor may be brought into competition with and their society insult the respectable people of this country.

And, now, the language he used in this colloquy with the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. WILLIAMS:]

The doctrines of the Morey letter are nothing more than this: that we should buy labor wherever we can get it the cheapest, and that the treaty should not be

abrogated until the labor market should have been supplied. I leave it to any member on this floor whether there is any sentiment in that letter which has not been repeated by my friend from Wisconsin here to-day.

Now, here is the Morey letter, as I find it quoted in the printed remarks of the gentleman from California, [Mr. PAGE:]

[Personal and confidential.]

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 23, 1880.

DEAR SIR: Yours in relation to the Chinese problem came duly to hand. I take it that the question of employes is only a question of private and corporate economy, and individuals or companies have the right to buy labor where they can get it cheapest.

We have a treaty with the Chinese Government, which should be religiously kept until its provisions are abrogated by the action of the General Government, and I am not prepared to say that it should be abrogated until our great manufacturing and corporate interests are conserved in the matter of labor.

Very truly, yours,

J. A. GARFIELD.

H. L. MOREY.

Is it not singular that notwithstanding President Garfield indignantly repudiated the sentiments of the Morey letter, yet his successor on this floor is accused by a leader of his own political party with advocating them less than one year after the tragic death of the lamented President? I believe the gentleman from Ohio to be not only able but kind-hearted, yet the logic of his argument certainly does subject him to the criticism of the gentleman from California.

REPUBLICAN ADVOCACY OF ENFRANCHISEMENT OF CHINESE.

Some seem as anxious to enfranchise the Chinese coolies as they have been to enfranchise the African. When discussing the apportionment bill, which lately became law, a Republican member of this House from New York, who was chairman of the committee reporting the bill, [Mr. PRESCOTT,] referring to the constitutional prohibition of Chinese suffrage in California, said:

Do you say the constitution of California, being in conflict with the Constitution of the United States, is void? I answer it is not for California to disfranchise her citizens at home and then come here and shield herself from the effect of her high-handed act of oppression and wrong by claiming her acts were void as they are unjust and tyrannical.

So it seems that the gentleman from New York is able to find that "disfranchisement," "oppression," "wrong," and "tyranny" have been practiced toward a colored race in a free State as he doubtless has often charged it was done in slave States.

HOW MANY OPPOSE CHINESE IMMIGRATION?

What proportion of the people in California are "blind" and "bigoted," as described by the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. WILLIAMS,] and are "tyrannical" and guilty of a "high-handed act of oppression and wrong," as charged by the gentleman from New York, [Mr. PRESCOTT,] or deserved to be called "demagogues," "sland-lotters," and "hoodlums," as they have been by others. The question of Chinese immigration was submitted to a vote of the people of California by an act of the Legislature in 1879, and the result was that 154,638 voted against and only 883 voted for Chinese immigration. A similar vote was taken in Nevada, with the result that 183 votes were cast for and 17,259 were cast against Chinese immigration.

Look at the platforms adopted by the two parties in their national conventions. That of the Republican party is equivocating, evasive, and cringing. So uncertain is it in sound that distinguished statesmen of the Republican party have been contending with each other over its interpretations in this debate, the Republican friends of this bill insisting that it is in harmony with the platform, while others contend it is at war with it.

POSITION OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

There is no ground for controversy over the meaning of the Democratic platform, neither the one adopted at Saint Louis nor that of the Cincinnati convention. They plainly, forcibly, and boldly define the true position of the party on this question. I have in my hand the Cincinnati platform, as you will find it in McPherson's Political Text-Book, a work prepared by a very clever gentleman of the Republican party, and the present Clerk of the House of Representatives. No Republican, therefore, will question the correctness of the authority. This is the language of the eleventh plank:

Amendment of the Burlingame treaty.

What further?

No more Chinese immigration, except—

And here is a qualification—

except for travel, education, or foreign commerce, and therein carefully guarded.

"No more Chinese immigration." That is the explicit declaration of this plank in the Democratic platform. Take up the bill now before this House and compare it with the eleventh plank in the Democratic platform and you must concede, Mr. Speaker, that it is reasonable to suppose that he who prepared this bill had this plank of the Democratic platform before him, or in his mind, and was guided by it in drafting the bill. Every Democrat throughout the length and breadth of this land who voted for General Hancock stood upon that platform and pledged himself to the principle enunciated in that plank. I shall obey its injunctions. I shall be guided by the principle therein enunciated and vote for this bill. I shall not now, sir, when I have been chosen upon a platform advocating the doctrines of this bill, come to this House and assume to myself

more patriotism or more wisdom than the national convention or the people who sent me here, and now take a position in opposition to the principles of the platform which I advocated before the people and upon which I was chosen a Representative.

I am not one of those who believe that platforms are constructed merely to catch votes. I regard the declaration of principles in the platform of a national convention of a political party as being of such solemn character that they should bind the consciences of those subscribing to them, and the policy laid down such as duty demands should be obeyed, and the pledges such as honor and good faith require should be fulfilled by all who accept a trust from that party. Nor do I hold him to be faithful to his obligations who makes a promise to the ear of his constituents when soliciting an election and yet breaks it to the hope when he takes his easy chair in this grand Council Chamber.

I do not, by these remarks, intend to insinuate that any person on either side of this Chamber who may vote against this bill is not faithful to his obligations or is derelict in his duty, for each should be permitted to construe platforms and his obligations according to his own judgment and conscience; but speaking for myself alone, and reading and understanding the terms of the treaty with China as I do, fearing the evils of Chinese immigration upon the morals and good order of society, dreading the danger which menaces the welfare of the workingmen of this country by Chinese slave labor, and finding in this bill the essence and policy of the Democratic platform, and conscientiously believing it a necessary remedy, and one demanded by public sentiment, I would fall far short of discharging my duty as a representative of the people if I failed to aid in its enactment by my vote.

The Democratic platform is different from that of the Republican party on this question. The bill does not go as far as our platform would permit us to go; it declares there should be "no more Chinese immigration except for travel," &c., but the bill simply suspends the immigration of Chinese laborers or coolies for the period of twenty years. On the other hand, under the interpretation placed upon the meaning of the term "reasonable" by the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. ROBINSON,] this bill is in violation of the letter and spirit of the Republican platform.

In view of the course pursued by the Republican party and many of its strongest leaders, is it a matter of surprise that a political revolution occurred in California and Nevada at the last election? When the workingmen of the Pacific States remembered all these things, and further remembered that the Republican party has ever been subservient to monopoly, while the Democratic party has ever been the true friend of labor, can any one be surprised that they mistrusted the one and trusted the other, and so cast their ballots at the last election?

CHARACTER OF CHINESE EMIGRANTS.

What sort of people are they whom those that oppose this bill desire to adopt into the American family, and make joint heirs with us and our posterity to all the grand privileges and prerogatives of American citizenship? It is also well that we should inquire what effect will these people produce upon the social, moral, and political condition of our country and the welfare of our toiling masses. Let us consult the evidence of truth-telling and capable witnesses who have had contact with these people. Here is the statement of Mr. Bailey, a consul of the United States in China for many years:

The subject of Chinese emigration from this port to the United States has claimed my careful thought and patient investigation for the last four months, with a view to get at the facts, and to understand it in its surroundings and bearings. The whole subject is an anomaly. Rules that will do elsewhere in the world, when applied in considering questions of immigration, have no application to Chinese immigration to the United States. Immigrants to America from other parts of the world go of their own volition, free and voluntary. Emigration from China to all parts of the world is an organized business or trade, in which men of large capital and hongs of great wealth engage as a regular traffic, by which men are bought and sold for so much per head, precisely as a piece of merchandise is handled, at its market value. The poor laborer of Europe applies his own scanty means to get to the land of promise, or is assisted by his friends, charitable societies, or benevolent institutions to reach a place where he hopes to have his toil properly requited, where his labor will inure to his own benefit. The cooly of China is bought by the rich trader to serve his purchaser at low wages for a series of years in a foreign country, under contract for the faithful performance of which in many instances he gives a mortgage on his wife and children, with a stipulation that at the end of his term of service he is to be brought back to China by his purchaser. This contract is sold by the dealer through his agents in the United States and elsewhere at a large advance, and is a source of great profit to the capitalists who have the means to buy and sell large numbers of men. This contract in the United States is no doubt null and void, but nevertheless the cooly will comply strictly with all its terms, a copy of which in Chinese characters is always in his possession, and this he will do because his purchaser holds his household *lares* in the land to which he always hopes and expects to return in pledge for the faithful performance of his bonds. The central idea of a Chinaman's religion, if he has any religion at all, is that of the worship of the tombs of his ancestors. The superstitions of Fung-Shney dominate him wherever he may be in the world. The subtle mysticism of China, so strangely governing all its people in their social, political, and quasi-religious life, are as a hook in his nose, by which his purchaser controls him at all times and in all places; and thus this relation of master and quasi-slave, no matter how many miles apart, is welded by the mystical links of religious superstitions, family ties, and rights of ancestral tombs, which control and regulate the reciprocal duties of trader and cooly in the home land.

The means of obtaining coolies are as various as the ingenuity of man can devise, and are as corrupt as the incentive to large gains can stimulate and invent. Men and boys are decoyed by all sorts of tricks, opiate, and illusory promises into the hands of the traders. Once in the clutches of these men-dealers, by a system of treachery and terrorism contrived at by the local Chinese authorities, whose chief business in life is to "squeeze" the people, the stupefied cooly is overawed into making a contract under such Chinese influences and surroundings as to give it a

sacredness of character nowhere else known in the world. From that moment he is the mere tool of the rich dealer wherever he may go. It is difficult for persons accustomed to western civilization to understand the depth and extent of this relationship; but Chinese civilization is unique, perhaps opaque, and cannot be measured by that of any other.

We also have the testimony of Bayard Taylor, the distinguished traveler and writer, who observed and studied the manners and customs of these people in their native land. This is his language:

It is my deliberate opinion that the Chinese are, morally, the most debased people on the face of the earth. Forms of vice, which in other countries are barely named, are in China so common that they excite no comment among the natives. They constitute the surface level, and below them are depths and depths of depravity so shocking and horrible that their character cannot even be hinted. There are some dark shadows in human nature which we naturally shrink from penetrating, and I made no attempt to collect information of this kind; but there was enough in the things which I could not avoid seeing and hearing, which are brought almost daily to the notice of every foreign resident, to inspire me with a powerful aversion to the Chinese race. Their touch is pollution, and harsh as the opinion may seem, justice to our own race demands that they should not be allowed to settle on our soil. Science may have lost something, but mankind has gained, by the exclusive policy which has governed China during the past century.

These are not the loose statements of sand-lot orators, demagogues, and hoodlums, but emanate from cultured minds—from thoughtful, observant, and conscientious gentlemen.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLOR] said in his speech when speaking of Chinese laborers the other day:

I venture to say that in my belief, considering their circumstances, they are more cleanly in their personal habits than any equal number of laboring people in the country.

Now, let Bayard Taylor, the traveler who was honored by this Government with a first-class diplomatic mission to one of the most important courts on the European continent, answer the gentleman from Ohio:

A Chinese city is the greatest of all abominations, and one ceases to wonder at the physical deformity or the monstrous forms of licentiousness which are to be found among the lower classes of the natives when he has seen the manner in which they live.

We now take a street which strikes into the heart of the city, and set out for the famous "Tea Gardens." The pavement is of rough stones, slippery with mud, and on one side of the street is a ditch filled with black, stagnant slime, from which arises the foulest smell. Porters, carrying buckets of offal, brush past us; public *cloacæ* stand open at the corners, and the clothes and persons of the unwashed laborers and beggars distil a reeking compound of still more disagreeable exhalations. Coleridge says of Cologne:

"I counted two and seventy stenches,
All well defined—and several stinks;"

but Shanghai, in its horrid foulness, would be flattered by such a description. I never go within its walls but with a shudder, and the taint of its contaminating atmosphere seems to hang about me like a garment long after I have left them.

This is evidence enough of the Chinese in their own country. Now, look at them as they are in this country. They are brought over as bondsmen, or in a state of servitude. Their women are imported as slaves and are sold for immoral purposes, the transportation of virtuous women being prohibited in China. They often sell their female children to be reared in houses of infamy for vile purposes. Every thing they gain in this country is sent back to China. Even when they die their bones are conveyed back to the mother country for burial. He brings nothing with him when he comes and leaves nothing in this land when he departs. They will not assimilate with our free institutions or our civilization. After twenty-five years' residence in California we find them unchanged and unimproved. They build their Joss houses for pagan worship in every town they inhabit. They do not come in search of homes or freedom, and are destitute of love for free institutions. History records no instance in which a Chinaman ever fought for liberty. During the late war every nation except China which sent emigrants to our shores was represented among the bravest of those who offered life and limb to save the Republic. No Chinaman was ever in the American Army in any war.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLOR] inquired, "How is it that this labor is injuring anybody?" and answers his interrogation further on by declaring that "labor does not compete with labor injuriously in this country, nor will it do so for a hundred years or a thousand years to come." Now I propose to let the laboring-men of California who have been in contact and competition with this servile Chinese cheap labor answer the gentleman. Here is a circular issued by the workmen of California to the working men and women of the United States. It is dated October 27, 1880:

The toiling masses of California, once occupying the proud position of being the best paid and most prosperous of any in the Union, are now reduced to want, and in many instances beggary, by a horde of Chinese who have obtruded themselves into every branch of industry. The Chinese come without families, know none of the attachments of home or domestic surroundings, live in holes and sleep on shelves; subsist on rice and other food imported from China, and do not assimilate with our civilization. On the Pacific coast the work of the factory and domestic service is in a great measure monopolized by them; so that the interests of the laboring women and children, no less than that of the men, are involved in the disastrous and unequal conflict between the two races, the one of a higher, the other of a lower civilization. They have almost entirely driven the whites from the cigar, boot and shoe, and clothing factories. They are extensively employed in woolen and broom manufactures, and the curing of fruits and fish. The laundry work is completely in their hands, and in fact there is scarcely any employment or manufacture in which they have not entered and supplanted the Caucasian. Our skilled laborers, men who have spent years in learning trades, walk the streets without employment during the day and return at night in despair to their improvised families and homes. Our boys are no longer apprenticed and are growing up in idleness, without work and without trades. Our girls are driven from domestic service. No one can hope to compete with the Chinese in any branch of labor in which they choose to enter, unless he sinks to their level,

gives up all home and family ties, lives as the Chinese do and becomes as they are, a mere human machine. The Mongolian evil has reached us and is now destroying us. It will soon be upon you.

It is not so far from New York to San Francisco as it is from Hong-Kong to San Francisco. The 400,000,000 Chinese have awakened from the slumber of ages; and unless their influx is checked, they will flood the Eastern States as they already have the Pacific coast.

EXTENT OF IMMIGRATION.

Some of those who favor Chinese immigration have ridiculed the fears that such an inundation of Mongolians may flow into this country as will outnumber all other races and eventually subvert our free institutions, our civilization and religion. I will not now attempt the justification or refutation of such apprehensions, but it must not be forgotten that the "children of the flowery kingdom" are estimated at about 434,000,000, nearly nine times as many as the entire population of the United States, and while China contains a large class who are highly cultured, eminent in statecraft, in the arts and sciences, yet the masses of her people are degraded, vicious, and are in a position of practical servitude, and it must also be remembered that it is only the dregs of her society, the coolies and those who are under bondage to the Six Companies, that are migrating to this country; that notwithstanding the hostility shown toward them the stream of immigration has been increasing for years, and they are now coming through the "Golden Gate" at the rate of 2,000 each month; over 100,000 are now on our shores. If they were distributed in equal proportions all over the United States but few would be seen in any community, but they have so far congregated mainly in one State, and now constitute more than one-half the adult voting population of California.

WHY HAVE RIOTS OCCURRED?

Menaced as the welfare of the workmen of California is by this servile race, their appeals for the protection of the strong arm of the Federal Government having been repeatedly neglected, is it a source of wonder that violent outbursts have occurred? If you should place the same number in any other State in this Union which has found lodgment in California, you would witness as much violence and bloodshed as has occurred on the Pacific coast. It has not been forgotten that when some manufacturers in North Adams, Massachusetts, in 1870, attempted to introduce Chinese cheap labor in their factories, a violent commotion was created among the workmen of the whole State, which has been graphically described by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. WILLIS,] who is entitled to as much credit for laborious and able service in behalf of legislation of this character as any member on this floor.

CHARACTER OF EUROPEAN IMMIGRANTS.

Some of the gentlemen on the other side have indulged in gratuitous flings at the European immigrants who reach our shores. As a specimen I will quote the language of the gentleman from Tennessee, [Mr. MOORE:]

Great stress is laid by some of the advocates of this bill upon the fact that poverty and prostitution are the characteristics of many of the Chinese immigrants; and there is a degree of force in the argument. But why not apply it to the many European immigrants also? There are certainly very large numbers of that class possessing the same peculiarities, and that they do not apply it is of itself alone one of the most eloquent arguments to prove the existence of the passion and prejudice to which we ascribe the chief opposition to these people.

Such comparisons are unjustifiable, unwarranted, and reflect upon the race from which the gentlemen who make them spring. The Irishman, German, Scandinavian, Englishman, and other Europeans migrating to this country come in search of homes and free institutions. They are of like mental and physical characteristics as our native-born; they are of a kindred race; their civilization is identical with our own, with similar traits and tendencies; their habits and manners conform to those of the people of this country, and they assimilate with our religion, our society, and become a part of the American people.

The children of the European emigrant born in this country can seldom be distinguished from the children of our native-born citizens. The European emigrant is desirable and should be welcomed, for he comes to build up the prosperity and glory of our land. They fought for our liberties at Bunker Hill and at Yorktown, they were with Jackson at New Orleans, they aided to plant the banner of the Republic upon the Halls of the Montezumas, and no gallant charge was made, no battle was fought during the late war when the arm of a European emigrant was not found in the forefront. He has participated in all the proudest achievements of diplomacy, statesmanship, and commerce which have made this the foremost nation on the globe.

There is no similarity between the Asiatic and European emigrant. They represent different and conflicting civilizations, and until the millennium dawns we can hope for no harmony or peace among the representative races of each. History informs us they have always been in antagonism. It is therefore best they should be separated. The world is large enough for both without encroachment upon each other.

I shall dwell no longer upon the vices and taint which attaches to the coolies, or what is more politely termed Chinese emigrants. Looking at it from the stand-point I do, I would deal with this evil on the same principle that the inhabitants of a city located on the lowlands of the Lower Mississippi guard against the danger of overflow when they erect a levee or barrier to keep out the submerging

waters; or, as the introduction of yellow fever into the country is prevented by quarantining against it, so would I erect an impassable barrier against the inundation of the servile coolies of China, and thereby guard this country from the social and political contamination of their polluting presence.

WHO ARE THE FRIENDS OF AMERICAN LABOR?

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the principal reason for opposition to Chinese immigration by the Democratic party? It is because of its sympathy for the toiling masses, because of its love for the welfare and happiness of the laboring classes of this land. The Democratic party has ever been the friend and the advocate of the rights and privileges of the poor man and of the laborer.

Mr. BROWNE, (from his seat.) That depends to some extent upon his color.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, of Illinois. You, gentlemen, have gone before the country claiming that you were the protectors of labor. You have claimed the creation of a tariff for the protection of American labor; but when its provisions and operations are examined it is found that this is a hollow pretension and it has no such result; that its real aim and effect is to enrich the lordly manufacturer.

PROTECTIVE TARIFF THE ENEMY OF THE AMERICAN LABORER.

The history of protection in this country warrants the strong conviction that opposition to this bill which emanates from the advocates of protection is moved less by considerations of humanity and universal fraternity than by a solicitude for the enhancement of the interest of the employer. They want to cheapen the cost of labor in the factories, whereby they may increase the profits of the owners. They care less for the influence, morally, socially, and politically, of this degraded and degrading race than they do to advance the interest of manufacturing. A tariff for protection only and Chinese cheap labor go hand in hand and are at war with the welfare of the American laborer. These allies want absolute free trade in labor, but the largest degree of protection for the monopolist. Protection demands the right to buy labor in the cheapest market of the world, and demands legislation which forces the consumer to purchase his wares in the dearest market. There is more of the real doctrine and effect of protection in the brief Morey letter than you will find in some of the longest speeches made by protective-tariff advocates.

This is no loose statement of my own, merely for political effect, for I am able to substantiate it by evidence which will be readily recognized and credited, by the most ultra Republican in the land. As far back as 1870, when the attempt was made to introduce Chinese cheap labor in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Henry Wilson, then a Senator, afterward Vice-President, remembering his own hard struggles for bread as a laborer in his early life, and ever a warm-hearted sympathizer with the American laborer, declared from his seat in the Senate:

I think the time has come when we should have some action upon this subject; for it does seem to me at the present day that there is a conspiracy of capital in this country to cast a drag-net over creation for the purpose of bringing degraded labor here to lower and degrade our laboring-men. And I think it is time to meet that question.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the time had come, as asserted by that philanthropic and far-seeing statesman, when the safety of the American laborer demanded protection, not only from the Chinese coolies, but from another "heathen Chinese," his false and hypocritical friend, the tariff monopolist. The true policy of this nation is to open our markets to the world, cheapen the cost of living, and to elevate and promote the welfare of the American laborer as well as of all classes within its borders. The glory, power, and greatness of this country can be far better accomplished by the distribution of wealth and happiness among the many than by the establishment of an aristocracy of monopolists or the absorption of wealth by a plutocracy. We will have discharged our highest duty, we will have reached the highest plane of patriotic statesmanship, we shall have obeyed the most solemn injunction of the Constitution when we have enacted such legislation as will best secure the blessings of liberty, peace, and happiness among the toiling masses, and promoted, not alone individual or corporate, but the general welfare.

THE GREAT POLITICAL ISSUE OF THE FUTURE.

Sir, we are rapidly approaching a period when the division line between the North and South in politics will have been entirely obliterated, and the conflicts of the two great parties will mainly center upon economic questions. The great issue which will overshadow and dwarf all others will be the one which will separate the friends and foes of labor. The general principles of the first underlie the Democratic party, while its great antagonist, the Republican party, has ever been subservient to the latter. It will not be a contest between the legitimate use of capital and labor, for capital and labor are mutually dependent upon each other, and should be and I hope will ever be friends, but the conflict will be between the avarice and oppression of monopoly and those who seek to conserve the rights and promote the prosperity of labor and of the masses.

WHO WANTS CHINESE SLAVE LABOR?

The demand for Chinese cheap labor comes mainly from New England, from the descendants of the people who, if they were not the first, were at least among the first who introduced African slavery in this country, and who were so fond of slavery that they enslaved

aboriginal Indians. Lest some one may dare question the accuracy of this statement, I will cite an authority. It is Horace Greeley, the best friend that the African ever had, and the best specimen of the Puritan that I have ever seen. You will find in his American Conflict, page 30, volume 1, this statement:

Indian slavery, sometimes forbidden by law but usually tolerated, if not entirely approved by public opinion, was among the early usages of New England; and from this to negro slavery—the slavery of any variety of pagan barbarians—was an easy transition. * * * The harsh climate, the rocky soil, the rugged topography of New England presented formidable though not impassable barriers to slaveholding. Her narrow patches of arable soil, hemmed in between bogs and naked blocks of granite, were poorly adapted to cultivation by slaves. * * * Slaveholding in the Northern States was rather coveted as a social distinction, a badge of aristocracy and wealth, than resorted to with any idea of profit or pecuniary advantage.

When the Puritan fathers found that slavery was not profitable in the climate of New England they sold them to their brethren of the South. The saying of a southern Senator uttered before the war may not be literally true, that the "Yankees sold their slaves to the South for the love of money and then stole them back again for the love of God," but there is enough in it to remind us that there are some in New England as well as in other localities of this country whose sordid motives actuate them to encourage the introduction of another class of servile labor in this country, even though it forces the white and black laborer into want and degradation. If they succeed in importing enough coolies to supply labor in our factories and other industries, what will be the fate of those of the Caucasian and the African races who are now dependent upon their daily labor for bread? But suppose the protectionists should fail to make the servile labor of China remunerative, and like their Puritan ancestors desire to get rid of it, what will they do with the bondsmen? I warn them that they will not dispose of them to the South as was done with the African slaves of the North. The South has turned her face to the sun of freedom and has spurned forever human slavery, be it either African or Asiatic.

THE INFLUENCES WHICH DOMINATE THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

The Republican party is dominated principally by two elements; one an office-seeking and the other a protective-tariff element; when you take out of the party those two elements you will find barely anything left. Now, the protective-tariff element is opposed to this bill, while the office-seeking element, with some exceptions, favors it. The latter element is anxious that they shall stand well with the voter upon the Pacific coast, while the other element is more solicitous of the interest of the policy of protection. When the roll-call on this bill is finished I think it will be found that that party is dominated more powerfully by the protective-tariff than the office-seeking element, but I may be mistaken in this.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAYLOR] undertook to lecture the Pacific slope Republicans in regard to their position. He said to the gentleman from California that the left wing of the Republican party was in a panic on this question. I think the California gentleman might have retorted that the right wing of the party was also in a panic on many other political questions before the country, and I now warn my friends that when the votes are counted in November next they will find the Republican party in a panic not only in its wings but also in its center, and in a rout not only on the Pacific coast but in the whole country.

This bill draws the line of demarcation between the true friends of American labor and its oppressors. On which side of the line will the representatives of the people be found? Their answer will be given in the roll-call which will soon be made.

Mr. PACHECO. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. ROBINSON.]

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. I believe I am entitled to ten minutes reserved yesterday, and will add that to the time now allowed me by the courtesy of the gentleman from California.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts will be recognized for twenty minutes.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. After the exceedingly calm, dispassionate, and philosophical speech we have just listened to from my friend from Illinois, [Mr. TOWNSHEND,] I do not think this House wants to enter into a partisan discussion. I shall address myself to what I consider the practical features of this bill. If I had length of time sufficient, I should be glad to go over the great underlying principles of this question, and to speak of what may be deemed the proper theory of legislation on these subjects; but time, and the patience of the House, and even its good nature forbid that I shall trespass at that length.

Before I pass on, however, it is due to a certain portion of my constituency that I notice, in a few words, some remarks that were made by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WILLIS] in his allusions to the coming of a few Chinamen into the State of Massachusetts to the town of North Adams. I think he was misled by some statements he read in the newspapers. What the gentleman is reported to have said did not at the time he was addressing the House attract my attention. But as reported in the Associated Press dispatches they would seem to do great injustice to the people of Massachusetts. On examination of the RECORD report I do not find it the same. But I recollect some of the apostrophes, if my friend will allow me to call them so, that do not appear in the report of the speech as printed.

In the report of the gentleman's speech by the Associated Press it is said that he declared—

The Chinamen had been driven from the village. It is proved that the humanity of the East, when put to the test, was as much opposed to this class of immigrants as the humanity of the West.

Mr. WILLIS. I do not wish to interrupt the gentleman, but I desire to disclaim having said that either on the floor of the House or anywhere else. I stand by every declaration I made either on the floor or upon the RECORD. But I never said that the Chinese had been driven from North Adams. I did say—but I could not restate what I did say without occupying the time of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and with the permission of the gentleman from California I shall hereafter restate and confirm what I have heretofore stated.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. I am very glad to have given the gentleman from Kentucky an opportunity of stating to the House that the report in the Associated Press dispatches is not correct; and that it was not true, as it certainly was not, that the Chinamen were driven from the town of North Adams. Going there in the year 1870, about seventy of them remained there nearly ten years, and they came and went of their own accord, and were not mobbed, or driven, or hooted away. They came about the time there was excitement about the employment of some laborers in shoe manufacturing establishments, and the people who came to supply the place of those who ceased to be employed, not Chinamen, were driven away in consequence, as sometimes happens on such occasions, of the feverish state of feeling which prevailed. As my friend quoted the narrative of what took place he stated that the Crispins from neighboring towns were driven off in the excitement of the moment. Therefore, what took place was not in consequence of anything applying to the Chinese as a race, but it was in consequence of the peculiar excitement and sensitiveness of the time.

Mr. WILLIS. I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts does not deny that at the election held three months afterward every other voter in the State of Massachusetts voted against Chinese immigration.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. The gentleman has stated that in his speech. I do not enter upon that question; I only wanted to make the correction so far as my own people are concerned.

My friend from Virginia, [Mr. TUCKER]—I speak of him with the highest respect for his ability—it seems to me, delights in nothing so much as to find some opportunity of discussing a constitutional question. And so in connection with this bill he had difficulty in finding whether the President and the Senate of the United States had the right to make a treaty. I cannot stop here to find whether they have the right, because it is not material. But this House has to recognize here that the President and two-thirds of the Senate have combined to make a treaty that we are now seeking to enforce by statute. And I commend to the gentleman for his reading, in addition to the authorities he has cited, such as he may find in Report No. 225, of the Forty-sixth Congress, third session, made by Hon. Judge Bicknell, of Indiana, on the treaty-making power. He will find that report strong and substantial, and I think it will cover the ground to show him that while the Constitution apportions out to the House of Representatives and to Congress certain duties, the difference is wide and plain between the law-making power and the treaty-making power.

But we come to this bill; and now, Mr. Speaker, I propose certain amendments to the bill in order that it may commend itself to the support of every gentleman in this House. I will state them without taking the time to read them. They are these:

I move, in the first section of the bill, to strike out "twenty years" and substitute "ten years."

I move, in the fifth section, to strike out the word "within" and supply "before the expiration of." And, if gentlemen will examine it, they will see, I think, there is a clerical error there, and that this change is necessary. Certainly it does not injure the bill in any sense of the word.

Lastly, I propose to strike out the seventeenth section of the bill. As my time is limited, I will speak of these amendments in the inverse order. I propose to take off the last section. Why not? It was not in the House bill. The House Committee did not recommend that. They do not, I believe, approve of it.

What use have we for that section? The treaty says "Chinese laborers;" nothing more. We cannot enlarge that language; it does not need any explanation. "Chinese laborers;" that is plain.

The section says in substance that the term "laborers" shall be construed to mean skilled and unskilled laborers and Chinese employed in mining. If the word "laborers" will include all these classes, then they are in the treaty. If it does not, we cannot put them in by legislation. That section, then, is utterly useless. I say to this House, and I believe it accords with the judgment of us all here, that we should stand within the field of the treaty and within the language and the power contained therein.

Some other amendments have been proposed by my honorable friend from Iowa, [Mr. KASSON.] He would go deeper in his criticism and changes. I do not find myself ready to go to that extent, nor do I think it necessary.

I would not take out of this bill the provision for the regulation of immigration, for the necessary safeguards as to immigration. And I will say why. The bill provides for what may be called passport

regulations. As to those who are laborers, there is a suspension as to their right of immigration; and perhaps there is no objection in the minds of any gentlemen to the application of these provisions to that class of laborers.

But it is said that this bill sets up a discrimination against what are called the privileged classes under the treaty. Let us see. What is it that we ask? Legislation of course is necessary to enforce this treaty. In the treaty we find that legislation may be enacted to enforce it, provided it is of such a character only as is necessary to enforce it.

Now, it is necessary to have an identification of the different persons who may seek to go from this country and come back again; I speak of the laborers. No one doubts that. And it is best that we fix those regulations here and now. Regarding the immediate and permanent success of this legislation, if it is proper at all, we cannot and we ought not to transfer to any other official, or to another branch of this Government, the duty of establishing the regulations that shall be made under this treaty.

Are the regulations provided by this bill wise? If so, then they should be adopted without delay. If the bill should have support, if it accords with the judgment of the House, then the sooner it is put in action the better. In this way there will be no delay, and there should be none, if these provisions are wise provisions of legislation.

Now, in regard to the privileged classes, what is required by this bill? The passport system, a descriptive list, stating the height of the man and shape of his nose, the color of his eyes, &c. So if you wanted to go abroad, Mr. Speaker, even to England or to France, you would fortify and protect yourself with a passport from the Secretary of State, giving the same particulars, and to the truth of the statements in your application for that passport you would make oath.

Mr. KASSON. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. If I can have time.

Mr. KASSON. You will be allowed additional time if it is taken up by interruptions. Does the gentleman mean to say that in any country of the world a passport requires the attestation by a competent witness of the place of birth, giving the town or district, the date of birth, the last place of residence abroad, the place of residence in the United States, and the names and residence of his parents? Or does the gentleman agree with the doctrine of Mr. Fish, repeatedly announced in our correspondence with England, that we have no right to put any condition upon the exercise of a treaty right which is not contained in the treaty itself?

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. My answer to the first proposition is this: although I do not know that any country so requires, I do not see why any country may not so require, when in its judgment it deems it best. In answer to the second question I would say that it is not a violation of the treaties of this Government with other countries that we should take such steps, because the other governments require of us passports with more or less particularity, as my friend certainly knows better than I do.

Mr. KASSON. Only a small portion of them do.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. And if a small portion of the governments of the world may demand that and we accede, do we not also have the same right to demand it of them?

Mr. KASSON. I want candidly to meet this question.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. And I desire candidly to meet it.

Mr. KASSON. The treaty contains no provisions or conditions whatever upon the exercise of the right.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. Not this treaty.

Mr. KASSON. We now require by this bill the consent of the Chinese Government to the departure of the individual; but I say that all these conditions are not known to international law and practice. I ask my friend whether he accepts the doctrine of our own Government that we have no right to put upon the enjoyment of a treaty right a condition by the legislation of one party to the treaty?

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. Undoubtedly that is correct; but what I now state is within the principles of international law upon the general practice in the observation of treaties the world over. It does not apply merely to the special treaty that was negotiated in 1880.

I pass on now and come to the first amendment which I have proposed—that is, as to the time of this suspension. I maintain that that is the important thing in all this discussion. It is the gist of the debate, and I submit it should challenge the fair, candid attention of every gentleman who is under the responsibility of a vote in this House.

The treaty has been often read and is well known. The United States may regulate, limit, or suspend such coming or residence of Chinamen, but may not absolutely prohibit it. The limitation or suspension shall be reasonable. You cannot prohibit but you may regulate, you may limit, and you may reasonably suspend; and there is the end of your power.

Now, we need have no difficulty with the words "regulate" or "limit," and it is not difficult to interpret the word "suspend." Suspend, to hold, to hang up, to stop for a time; that is the idea. It does not mean to prohibit; it does not mean to terminate. It means only to hang up for a little while; that is the idea.

"Such suspension shall be reasonable." Now how shall we arrive at the reasonableness of any measure that may be proposed here?

What is the test? In interpreting a legal document we are generally prevented from going outside and taking testimony as to conversations that may have occurred at the time it was made. But I suppose it will not be claimed that we are bound by any such narrow and technical rule in the interpretation of a treaty. We have a right to base our judgment in this case not only upon the immediate circumstances of this country and the country with which we are dealing, but we may also take into account and weigh the declarations, conversations, and considerations entertained by the high commissioners in the negotiation of this treaty.

Now, let us take this treaty in its inception. Go back with me to the time when this difficulty commenced. It commenced not thirty years ago, but only a few years ago. I mean to say it found its most vital expression only recently. In the Forty-fifth Congress we passed an act which met the Executive veto. It was an act in violation of a treaty, as we all know now, and I believe no one of us here, whether of one party or the other, would be found rejoicing in his vote in favor of an act which he knew to be in violation of the good faith of this country toward other nations.

We found that to be the case, and the demand was for a change of the treaty. The people of the western slope desired what? Most certainly to stop absolutely the coming of the Chinese. They said, "We do not want any more Chinese to come here forever and forever more." Our commissioners went to China backed as we might say, not alone by the general sentiment of the country that they should treat upon the whole question, but feeling behind them, of course, the strong pressure of that western locality. They met the Chinese ambassadors, and what was the negotiation? Our commissioners at once proposed to say to the Chinese Government, "We desire a prohibition of the coming of Chinese laborers to our country." The Chinese Government at the outset said through their commissioners promptly, "The Chinese Government cannot entertain a proposition for prohibition; that word must go out." Out it went and it never returned. They said that we could not prohibit, but we might limit, we might regulate, we might suspend.

Now, what was the conversation? Let us see how our commissioners talked to the Chinese commissioners. The Chinese commissioners insisted that the proposition for limitation or suspension should not amount to prohibition. All this is very plainly and abundantly set forth in the official report of the negotiations communicated to the Senate, and I refer to it, wishing I had time to read from it at length. No one after an examination of that report can have a reasonable doubt of the fair understanding of all the commissioners, American and Chinese.

To illustrate their idea, they said that they thought it might be within the terms of the treaty that Chinese laborers should be allowed to come here in alternate years or every three years, or that they should not be allowed to come here for two, three, or five years.

Recollect that this treaty was framed for the purpose of preparing the way for legislation to enable the United States Government to shut out the Chinese. It was not to enable the Chinese Government to keep them away from our shores. Now, our commissioners suggested in reply—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBINSON] has expired.

Mr. PEELLE. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to continue his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RANDALL. What is the request?

The SPEAKER. For an extension of the time of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. RANDALL. If it is to come out of the last hour of debate, after the ordering of the previous question, I do not object.

Mr. MOORE. I suggest that the same courtesy that has been extended to other gentlemen ought to be extended to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PAGE. The previous question has not been ordered yet.

Mr. RANDALL. If this extension of time is to come out of the hour after the ordering of the previous question, I have no objection; otherwise I object.

Mr. SPRINGER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts be allowed fifteen minutes to conclude his remarks. I think there ought to be no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. I object. We want a vote to-day.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. I do not want to go on if any gentleman in the House objects.

Mr. HAWK. There was an understanding when the gentleman from Massachusetts was interrupted that he should have further time.

Mr. PAGE. If there is objection to extending the gentleman's time I shall have to yield him ten minutes, to be taken out of the time which I shall have after the previous question is ordered.

Mr. RANDALL. I have no objection to that.

Mr. MCCOOK. And let it be understood that no one is to interrupt the gentleman from Massachusetts. Five minutes of his time have been consumed in that way.

Mr. GIBSON. I hope the same courtesy that was extended to our side yesterday will be extended to the other side to-day.

Mr. RANDALL. On courtesy we are about even. We desire to vote upon this bill to-day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to allowing the gentleman from Massachusetts to proceed for ten minutes longer, and his additional time to be deducted from the hour to which the gentleman from California will be entitled to close the debate? The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. WHITE. I rise to a question of order. I would like to know whether this proceeding implies consent that the gentleman from California is to close debate and cut off many of us who have had no opportunity to speak?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California, who has control of the measure, must decide for himself when he will call the previous question. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBINSON] is now recognized for ten minutes.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. I will proceed then with my remarks.

Mr. PAGE. If the gentleman will yield to me I will now demand the previous question on the bill and pending amendments. I will then take the floor for the hour to which I am entitled to close the debate and will yield ten minutes of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. ROBINSON.]

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. I will yield for that purpose.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. Speaker, I demand the previous question on the pending bill and amendments.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I ask the gentleman to yield to me to offer an amendment.

Mr. PAGE. I will yield for that purpose.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I move to strike out "twenty," where it occurs, and to insert "fifteen."

The SPEAKER. That amendment will be considered as pending.

Mr. HOOKER. I also have an amendment which I desire to offer.

Mr. PAGE. Send it up and let it be considered as pending.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires it to be understood, so that there may be no difficulty hereafter, that last evening the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KASSON] was permitted to offer his amendments, which had been printed, and they are now pending. Now, by like consent it is the understanding that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER] are also to be considered as pending.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. I believe, Mr. Speaker, I also have offered some amendments.

The SPEAKER. And that they also shall be considered as pending.

Mr. CANDLER. I desire to offer an amendment to strike out the eleventh section.

Mr. PAGE. Let these amendments be sent up to the Clerk's desk in writing, and be considered as pending. I do this in return for the kindness shown me by both sides of the House in the consideration of this measure.

The SPEAKER. This proceeding is irregular. It is only allowed by unanimous consent.

Mr. WHITE. I object.

Mr. PAGE. Objection comes too late. The House on both sides treated me kindly in allowing the Senate bill to be taken up and considered in place of the House bill. I feel myself, therefore, in honor bound to allow these amendments to come in and be considered as pending. I give notice, however, that at the close of the debate I shall ask that all amendments shall be voted down and the Senate bill passed as it came to us.

Mr. RANDALL. I have a suggestion to make which, I think, will lead to our voting intelligently on these various amendments, and that is that they shall be voted on in the order in which they apply to the sections respectively; but if there be more than one amendment to a particular section, that then they shall be voted on in the order of their presentation.

Mr. KASSON. That is, regardless of the order of presentation.

Mr. RANDALL. So far as the sections are involved that the amendments shall be voted on in order as they apply to the sections; but that when three or four amendments are pending to the same section, they shall be voted on in the order in which they were presented to the House.

Mr. KASSON. That is my own proposition. As we are now acting outside of the rules, it is necessary that some such arrangement should be made.

The SPEAKER. So there may be no confusion, the Chair would like to suggest that where there are amendments pending to a section they shall be voted on before the vote is taken on the motion to strike out the section.

Mr. SPRINGER. Allow me to make a suggestion. Several amendments are pending to strike out "twenty" and insert different numbers. I think those amendments ought to be voted on under the rules of the House.

Mr. PAGE. That is proper.

Mr. KASSON. There will be no difficulty in getting at the votes on those various amendments.

The SPEAKER. So the Chair thinks.

Mr. SPRINGER. But where there are several amendments to strike out "twenty" and insert "ten," we do not wish to vote on more than one motion of that sort.

Mr. KASSON. Of course not.

Mr. RICE, of Massachusetts. I wish to offer two amendments to the first section.

The SPEAKER. They will be considered as pending.

Mr. KASSON. And I desire to offer a substitute for the whole bill.

Mr. McLANE. Is there unanimous consent to entertaining more than the number of amendments allowed by the rules?

The SPEAKER. Unanimous consent has been granted for that purpose.

Mr. McLANE. I should have objected to it.

The SPEAKER. The House has given unanimous consent to the introduction of amendments to be voted on in their order to the several sections as they are reached, except where there are several amendments to the same section, and they are to be voted on in the order of their presentation.

Mr. McLANE. Without limitation?

The SPEAKER. Limitation must be made by the introduction at this time, as no amendments can be offered after the previous question has been called.

Mr. PAGE. I now demand the previous question on the bill and pending amendments.

Mr. CULLEN. I ask to offer an amendment.

Mr. PAGE. Very well; I will allow the gentleman's amendment to come in, and I think I have been quite liberal. If this thing goes on I shall expect to see a copy of the Revised Statutes sent up next. [Laughter.]

Mr. CULLEN. I send my amendment up to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The amendment sent up by the gentleman from Illinois will also be considered as pending.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. I offer an amendment, and send it up to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. PAGE. All the amendments are now in, and I demand the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. PAGE moved to reconsider the vote by which the previous question was ordered; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. PAGE. I now take the floor, to close the debate, for the hour to which I am entitled under the rules, and yield for ten minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that it was not stated—

Mr. BURROWS, of Michigan. I would like to ask a parliamentary question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURROWS, of Michigan. I wish to ask by what rule the gentleman from California has a right to an hour's time for debate after the previous question has been ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that it is under the uniform practice of the House.

Mr. BURROWS, of Michigan. I call the attention of the Chair to the fourteenth rule, clause 3, in the following words:

The member reporting the measure under consideration from a committee may open and close, where general debate has been had thereon, &c.

Now this measure is not reported from any committee of this House. It does not therefore come within the clause of this rule. I simply desire to have the question settled as to whether a Senate bill, taken from the Speaker's table on the motion of any member, would come in under the operation of this rule.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would state that perhaps the gentleman from Michigan lays too much stress upon the words "reporting the measure." It may have a more extended meaning than that which is ordinarily given to it under the rule. The gentleman having in charge the measure may be regarded as reporting it; but in this case there is no difficulty presented. The bill, which was made a special order of the House, was a bill reported from the Committee on Education and Labor. By unanimous consent, when the special order was reached, which was in charge of the gentleman from California, [Mr. PAGE,] the Senate bill now before the House was, on his motion, substituted for the House bill, and we proceeded as though this bill had been made the special order instead of the House bill. Therefore this bill, the Chair thinks, for all the purposes of the rule, should be treated as though originally reported from the committee. The Chair holds that the gentleman from California is entitled to one hour to close the debate.

Mr. BURROWS, of Michigan. I only wanted to have the question settled, to obtain a ruling upon it.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. I was about saying, Mr. Speaker, that it was not stated in the conversation that the United States would demand any such measure as that proposed here. That was not anticipated by the Chinese commissioners. It was not intimated by the American commissioners. There was no suggestion of such a measure; and upon the understanding there reached our commissioners were enabled to negotiate this treaty with the Chinese, which we should carry out in good faith and in justice to the good name of the American people. The commissioners assured them that their dealings had been of that character. The Chinese said, We will repose in confidence upon the acts of this great Government. Now, if twenty years is more than is necessary, is unreasonable for the suspension, of course you will not take that time. We rely upon you.

Twenty years in the life of this nation—twenty years ago. Mr. Speaker, run back the history. Look for the men that figured then in the councils of this country. Look at the great march of events. Look at the swelling of the population of America. Regard, I say, what has transpired in that time, and see whether in your opinion you regard twenty years as a reasonable, as a necessary time for the suspension of this immigration. We have gone from thirty-eight millions to nearly fifty-one millions in our population. It will take you over five Presidential terms, and ten Congresses; and assuredly, if you think a moment, when there is behind it all reserved the power under this treaty, if wise and proper, to re-enact the suspension, if at that time we find it necessary, as much again may we proceed to regulate, to limit, or even to suspend it, if necessary, after an interval, or immediately, in order to give force and vitality to that treaty.

Therefore the country is in no danger. If it be limited to ten years it cannot be said that we have overreached anybody in this matter. As the gentleman from Virginia stated, it shall be reasonable provided it gives a good opportunity for this country to stop that immigration long enough to work the result. Now, when you stop it absolutely for ten years, and you have got this present force of 105,000 already in the country not increasing, the result is that in the nature of things at the expiration of that period perhaps a quarter of them, or a large portion of them, return to their own country never to come to us again; and at the end of that time we may not deal in this matter with this difficulty.

It may be that it will not seriously affect our interests, as the treaty says. But some of you here say if you are willing to limit it for a reasonable time, why do you say that ten years is reasonable and not twenty years? You who are honestly in favor of the bill, if any, why do you not propose to make it for fifty years; why do you not say ninety-nine years, if you want prohibition?

You have no right to make prohibition. This country cannot afford to attempt to overreach or to adopt a process that is not in accordance with our agreement. You ought to adopt that which is reasonable.

We understand that as construed in the courts; we know it as settled sometimes at the bar by the judgment of common-sense men. This must be settled, not here and now alone, but in the years to come by our own consciences and at the bar of the civilized world. The United States of America has a reputation that we would not seek to sully. We had better come within the limit than step as much as a hair's breadth beyond it. We can with safety take only the step that is necessary now. Let the future be determined by the coming necessities.

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. McLANE] said yesterday that it was our right under this treaty to say what was reasonable and nobody could deny it. That was the substance of his argument. Ah! that would be true if the treaty said the suspension may be for such time as the United States deems reasonable. Ah! but that was not what was said. "Reasonable." Yes, come up to that bar of honesty, and justice, and fair dealing, where man with man must come when he settles questions of this kind.

My friend said "the Chinaman gave himself away, and he had to give himself away." I lament that expression in the great Hall of the people. The United States, thank God, will repudiate that idea whenever promulgated, that when any people, great or small, of any color, however degraded, come upon a footing of equality to treat with the United States of America, boasting of its Christianity and civilization, the people will repudiate the idea that this Government will say to them, "We have reached out and got you in our grasp, and you had to give yourselves away to us." It is not the right thing for a man unless his name is Shylock, and it is not the right thing for a free and humane and just and civilized Government. But, sir, if that is the outcome of sending the Bible to China, pray keep the Bibles all at home, for we need them, every one.

No, sir; make this as it ought to be, reasonable. It is not a question of party. It is a question of honesty. When my friend from Maryland went abroad he told us, from his experience, the people of China spit on the ambassador of America. Ah! perhaps they will have occasion to do so in the future if we are not worthy of higher conduct on their part. Let us stand upon our good faith. Let us not sully it—not only when we deal with England, or France, or Germany, but when we deal with the poorest or meanest of all the nations of the world.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with the limitation imposed upon this bill I am not in favor of it. I cannot give it my vote. I can go to the extent of ten years. I know a great many others that would be glad to do so. Let us take this out of the mire and the dust of party politics, and if there is anything of principle or honor or honesty, aye, if there is anything of devotion to the interests of labor and the poor people of this country, let us at this time join hands, that in good faith we may put on the statute-book that which will accomplish the result and leave us entitled to the glory of our justice and our honesty and good faith, worthy of the admiration of all the people of the earth. [Applause.]

Mr. PAGE. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. WILLIS.]

Mr. WILLIS. I do not propose at this late hour to consider any further the principles upon which this bill rests. But a remark of

the gentleman who has just taken his seat, [Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts,] in regard to certain statements I made on a previous day touching the Chinese at North Adams, Massachusetts, seems to call for some reply.

And more especially do I feel called upon to reply, inasmuch as my attention has been called to a number of very unkind, and, as I shall hope to show, very unjust comments from the press of that State. I have before me a recent issue of the Boston Daily Advertiser, in which after quoting the Associated Press dispatch, in which I am represented as having said that "the Chinamen had been driven from the village," the editor denies the statement and concludes:

We may add for the benefit, not of Mr. WILLIS nor of anybody who prefers to repeat a false accusation than to know the facts, but of all who are willing to do justice to New England consistency, that the Chinese were not driven from the village, but remained there peaceably during the whole term for which they agreed to come, and left at the end of that time, not by compulsion, but because they could do better elsewhere. These are the plain facts of the case.

Of course this is one of the least important of the considerations to be taken into account in discussing the anti-Chinese bill. The fact that Massachusetts has given fair and humane treatment to the Chinese who have come within the Commonwealth is as pertinent, not more so, as the contrary fact that in California and other Pacific States the Chinese have been oppressed by unequal laws and maltreated with impunity. It proves nothing except that Congressmen ought to be careful when they are accusing a community of inhumanity and inconsistency.

Now, sir, there is a brief reply to this and similar editorials and it is a reply which I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts, who honors that State by his presence here and whom we all honor and esteem, will accept as conclusive, and that is that neither upon this floor nor elsewhere did I ever make the assertion that the "Chinese had been driven from North Adams." And as this is one of the few instances upon record where the Associated Press has misquoted what has been said in the excitement and confusion of debate upon this floor, I acquit it cheerfully of any intentional wrong.

What I did say, Mr. Speaker, may be embraced in four propositions of facts, and to these I challenge attention and contradiction.

First, That the Chinese, when they reached North Adams, were greeted by a crowd of several thousand excited individuals with jeers, hootings, and threats. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts deny that?

Secondly, I did state, quoting from a letter written upon the spot July 1 by a correspondent of the New York Standard, that the Chinese were "kept away from the village for prudential reasons," and that when they went out to make purchases of food and garments it was necessary for them to be "properly guarded from insult." And in the same connection I stated that monster meetings protesting against their presence were held at North Adams and at all the leading cities of Massachusetts and of the eastern slope. Is any one of these facts called in question?

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman mean during the whole time they staid there, or at first?

Mr. WILLIS. I refer now, as I did in the remarks I formerly made, to the period of their arrival and to the two or three weeks succeeding that time. I have before me the New York Tribune and the New York Herald for the months of June and July, 1870, which substantiate every statement I have made. In a letter dated North Adams, June 16, in the Tribune of June 18, 1870, under the head of "Coolies vs. Crispins," "Ah My in Massachusetts," "The new phase of the Chinese question," "The Crispin trouble," I find the following:

Mr. Sampson determined to sink \$50,000, if necessary, in carrying the thing through. He doubles his night-watch, illuminates the grounds about his building by powerful reflectors, laughs at the threats of the Crispins, and is confident of success as of the rising of the sun to-morrow.

Are these the evidences and preparations of peace? In a Tribune editorial of June 15, 1870, I find:

The demonstration of the Crispins, whose strike has compelled manufacturers to import these cheap cooly laborers, was serious at first, but having dwindled to mere threats, will result in nothing else. We are glad to have this experiment tried, but we don't like to see crowded New England made the scene as long as unpopulated and just as rich districts are groaning for laborers.

In the New York Herald of July 3, 1870, is a letter dated North Adams, July 2, 1870, in which I find the heading "First appearance of the Orientals in the public streets," followed by the words "Until to-day the Chinamen have kept shy and secluded." Then there is a full history of the facts and a reference to a bill which Senator Wilson, of Massachusetts, had introduced in Congress upon the subject. So much, then, for the reception and treatment of these seventy-five Chinese. I have before me in the Herald reports of several large mass meetings at North Adams and elsewhere in Massachusetts; also in Connecticut, New York, and at other points in the East, which show the excitement then prevailing.

Thirdly, I called attention to the attitude of leading statesmen of Massachusetts upon this subject, quoting from a speech made by Hon. Henry Wilson, then a Senator from that State, in which, on the 23d of June, 1870, he took a bold and unequivocal position against the coming of the Chinese to his State or to this country. I might have gone further and given the bill which he introduced and advocated to prohibit this form of servile labor. I might also have cited the speech of Hon. Benjamin F. Butler, (then, if not now, a leading Republican statesman of Massachusetts,) when on the 4th of July of the same year, in the presence of President Grant and a large concourse of distinguished citizens at Woodstock, Connecticut, he boldly proclaimed his opposition to Chinese immigration as subversive of free

institutions. I might also have given the details of an indignation meeting held on June 23, 1870, at North Adams, in which, as I find from the New York Herald of June 26, three or four thousand people were assembled and to whom fiery and inflammatory speeches were delivered. Among others, "Mr. Troup made an enthusiastic speech and suggested the sending of an influential man to Washington to urge Congressman DAWES to look after their interests and hasten the consideration of Wilson's bill."

The result of this proposed pilgrimage to Congressman (now Senator) DAWES I regret to be unable to record. Are any of these facts denied?

Fourthly, As a more formal and conclusive evidence of Massachusetts sentiment I referred to the official proceedings of two political conventions in the State. Was I in error as to this? Will my friend from Massachusetts deny that the people of his State, at the gubernatorial election of 1870, cast over 70,000 votes against Chinese immigration, that issue having been presented in the party platform of that year? In other words, will he deny that every other voter in Massachusetts, over eleven years ago, cast his ballot against Chinese immigration? I have here before me Appleton's Cyclopaedia for 1870, which gives the result. Wendell Phillips, the candidate of the Labor Reform party, received 21,946 votes, John Quincy Adams received 49,536, both of whose platforms opposed Chinese immigration, being a total of 71,482, and William Claflin, Republican, whose platform ignored the question, received 79,549 votes. I ask again, wherein have I misstated or exaggerated any material facts?

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts, rose.

Mr. WILLIS. Why, Mr. Speaker, do I again refer to these facts? It is simply to vindicate myself against the very serious charge, as stated in the newspaper extract which I have read, of falsely "accusing a community of inhumanity and inconsistency." Sir, I do not consider that any fact I have stated, or even that I am incorrectly reported as having stated, would fasten upon the community of North Adams, or upon the people of Massachusetts, the charge of "inhumanity." On the contrary, even had these pagan intruders been driven forth from the boundaries of the State, it would in my judgment have been justifiable upon grounds of humanity and self-preservation to the worthy and more deserving laborers of Massachusetts, who, through them, would have been robbed of their homes, their firesides, and their means of honest livelihood.

Sir, if any charge is to be made upon this floor against either the humanity or the liberality of Massachusetts, it will never fall from my lips. There is no State in this Union, as far as my observation goes, whose representatives, here or elsewhere, have been more ready to recognize the wants and demands of all parts of our country; none who have been more just, more generous, and more patriotic than those of the old Bay State. And in so being and so doing they have only reflected the sentiments of the liberal and progressive people whose worthy agents and representatives they are. I disclaim, therefore, in my reference to Massachusetts, any intention other than to support the argument I was endeavoring to make that everywhere there was an instinctive feeling of repulsion and judgment of condemnation against the Chinese which made it undesirable, if not impossible, to bring them together in the same community.

Mr. PAGE. I yield now ten minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. CURTIN.]

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. I hope I may be allowed to say a word in reply to the gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. WILLIS.] It is hardly fair that he should put these questions to me when I cannot answer them.

Mr. WILLIS. I will incorporate in my answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts statements from the New York Herald and the New York Tribune.

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the gravity of the question now before the House surely entitles it to all the distinguished ability with which it has been argued. I have not the temerity to suppose that I can give to any member on this floor any reasons for a change of the judgment to which he may have arrived from that discussion; yet representing a part of the people of this country, I am extremely obliged to the gentleman from California [Mr. PAGE] in charge of this bill for the time which it has been his pleasure to assign to me to express to the House my reasons for the vote which I shall give.

It is common for gentlemen on this floor, as I have learned since I have had the honor of a seat here, to speak of labor and of its protection as one of the cardinal duties of a representative of the American people; and labor, sir, cannot be magnified as the great source of values, of improvements, and of progress. I have never heard a gentleman on this floor advocate any bill or measure looking to progress or development or production when he failed to mention the protection of labor as the first duty he owed to his constituents; and who has ever known a member of Congress when a candidate for office who did not on the hustings declare himself the friend and sturdy advocate of all measures which might foster, protect, or advance the interests of labor? Now, Mr. Speaker, for the first time in the history of the legislation of this Government Congress is brought face to face with the clear and well-defined question of labor unalloyed by the paramount protection of any of the diversified interests which employ labor as the primary subject of legislation.

This, sir, is not a question of the incorporation of companies; it is not a measure giving vast dominions to corporations or companies

of citizens; it is not subsidies, it is not money or capital to be protected, leaving labor to be employed in the vast avenues of trade and commerce, into which capital invites labor as a mere incident to protection. The American Congress stands to-day in the presence of a clear and well-defined question of the protection of a class of American citizens who most need and deserve the munificence of our Government. On the western slope of the United States 100,000 Chinamen take the place of 100,000 American citizens.

Disguise it as you will, conceal or cover it with the humanitarian principles underlying our structure of government, summon from the history of the past, as has been done on this floor during the long debate, the sublime utterances of the Continental Congress through the Declaration of Independence, what is the question we are to meet in our votes on this measure? It is sentiment and only sentiment; and it fades before the wonderful growth and changing interests of the country, its progress, its wealth, its great future, and the true logic of the necessities of the condition of our people and Government now present, as did the silver tones of the great bell when the fathers of the Republic sealed their immortal fame in the declaration, and rung out the proclamation of liberty and equality to all humanity. And here we are in the presence of the question which, I repeat, is the protection of American labor. Do we prefer to have 100,000 Chinamen take the place of 100,000 American laborers, part and parcel of the body-politic, owing allegiance to our Government, with the right of the ballot, insuring for their children our free education, and with American hopes and aspirations?

I say to my friends on the other side if you are in favor of protecting labor you now have the opportunity. This Government only answers the expectations of its great founders, and becomes truly a state when it is united and perfect in its homogeneity and relieved from all sectional divisions. If when we disturb the interests of the people of Maine it should affect the people of California, and if we interfere with the rights or interests, the happiness, or prosperity, or fail to redress wrongs suffered by the people of Oregon, our action or failure to act vibrates in Florida, and will be felt by the people there, as if they were the sufferers. When there is real unity and harmony in our governmental organization we protect all the people of all the country, and we provide redress and remedy to any evils or wrongs suffered by any portion of the people or section of the country.

When the people of California or of any part of the Pacific coast knock at the doors of the Congress of the United States and present in evidence not to be impeached and in language of truth not to be misunderstood, in the almost unanimous declaration of the people, and through the united voice of all their representatives in these Halls that they suffer from the introduction of a foreign element not in harmony with the rights and interests, and interrupt the prosperity and pursuit of happiness of a large body of American citizens who have cast their lot there; when it is claimed by them that there should be a preference to American labor over recently imported Chinese labor; the whole people of the United States are touched by the appeal, and it is our right as it certainly is our duty to protect and defend their citizens against the introduction of this new element which they declare disturbs their peace and interferes with the rights and interests of a large portion of their people. I need not say in this intelligent presence, so thoroughly versed in the duty of the Government of the United States to protect labor, that it is our first duty to the constituents who sent us here, nor need I remind gentlemen on this floor that it is it which has made us great. Labor has developed the resources of our country and lies at the foundation of our wealth, our prosperity, and our power. It is from the exactions taken from the toil of the man who works a day for an honest day's pay, which is but the dictate of common honesty, that all the wealth and prosperity of this country comes.

I am selfish enough to believe that it is time that this great country should say, if it is our pleasure, to all the world who may come here and who shall not come, and on that serious question the American people will judge wisely and justly whose coming may not interfere with the prosperity of American citizens by birth or adoption, and it is surely the duty as it is in the province of our Government to interfere when that question is presented, as in the present measure; and whatever there may be in the future, we are only called to deal with living facts and actual condition and demands. If the people of California are oppressed or wronged, if their rights and interests are affected by the introduction of Chinese labor to the exclusion of American labor, this Congress will perform its duty by answering their appeal to the magnanimity and power of their central Government.

It is said on this floor, and it is a sentiment which can bear repetition, that we opened the portals of our Government and invited the oppressed people of all the world to come here in peaceful approach and enjoy our true civil and religious liberty and the dead-level of American social organization; and yet who would for a moment believe in that liberal declaration which is claimed in its behalf in this discussion.

We would not suffer paupers or criminals or diseased people to come here to spread contagion or disturb us by crime in order to make this continent a great reformatory asylum, which it would become if the declarations of gentlemen on this floor were carried to their full and logical conclusions. We might reform such people and cure their diseases, but they might infuse their virus into the health and morality of the American people.

There will come a time when the great nation will be understood by all the family of the nations of the world; and the governments of the nations of Western Europe cannot regard us and our free system with the satisfaction and the affection of which we are accustomed to hear so much, and which, I must be permitted to say, is the sublimity of sentimentalism.

Our great ideas of human liberty and the rights of the citizen have undermined the legitimate governments of Europe silently, constantly, progressively, and surely to final consummation, until centralized power has been heroically claimed, demanded by, and given to the masses, and the emperor and the king remain but the nominal heads of governments where public opinion has asserted its power in the regulation of all authority, and is rapidly settling their destiny for the future, when their governments will be more and more assimilated to ours. We take the German, the English, the French, the Irish, the Scandinavian, people from all nationalities of Western Europe. They or their children learn our language, accommodate themselves to our social organization, swear allegiance to our Government, become part of our people—our equals. They deserve our protection, as they contribute to our wealth. The Chinaman, in his instincts, in his birth and his feelings, remains a Chinaman after twenty-five years' residence upon the western slope. He is without the influence and happiness of home, wife, and children, and his rigid selfish nature is not chastened by the influences of social enjoyments. The Chinaman has not broken his allegiance to his native country. He is incensed in and controlled by superstition and caste, which has bound him in its fetters and his country for more than fifty centuries, and no matter to the Chinaman how long he remains in this country, those who know him best and have studied his nature and habits tell us the desire to return once again to the Flowery Kingdom is ever present with him, and in the article of death his last wish is that his bones shall be sent back and buried there.

The Representatives from the Western coast tell us that he only seeks to get money enough to return to China and provide for his scanty living there. He never has assimilated with our people, and he never will. Surely if he ever intended to, the experiment of twenty-five years has failed to accomplish what gentlemen on the other side say may be accomplished in the future. It is perfectly proper that we should feel for oppressed humanity, that we will give to all the people of the earth our Christian faith, and teach them to demand as their natural right the large liberty and individuality which we enjoy and cultivate under our system of Government; but it is carrying sentiment to the extreme when we will not relieve the people of any part or section of this country from the presence of men who they allege do not contribute to their prosperity, but degrade the labor of the American, and who fail to become citizens of the United States, yield allegiance to our Government or accept our religious faith, our language or our morals. The gentleman from Massachusetts says the Chinamen does not increase. No, sir, he does not. There are physical reasons why he cannot, except by immigration.

If the people of California are affected in their interests by the presence of the Chinese, then, if we are a Government and a state, this appeal comes to every man in this country influenced by patriotism. Patriotism, sir, is not confined to a locality, and I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts it is not confined to New England, and I would not claim it for Pennsylvania alone. Patriotism is not fondness for your home, or county, or town, or state, or the amities of our social surroundings, however pleasant they may be, or to your family, to whom you may be tenderly attached, and make life desirable and happy, but is a holier and higher sentiment, which wells up from the human heart and makes the true citizen regard every man within the borders of his country as his brother; and if the people of the western slope are affected in their enjoyment of life by the presence of these people it is my patriotic duty and yours to protect and defend them against what they should know and present as a wrong and claim redress from the American Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, is my time out?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. CURTIN, (to Mr. PAGE.) What say you, sir? Shall I have more time? Shall I have five minutes more?

Mr. PAGE. Very well.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection to the gentleman from Pennsylvania proceeding.

Mr. RANDALL. To come out of the time of the gentleman from California.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] to object to his colleague proceeding unless the additional time comes out of the hour of the gentleman from California.

Mr. MANNING. I understand that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAMMOND] is willing to give his time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PAGE. If the gentleman from Georgia is willing to give his five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, of course I have no objection.

Mr. HAMMOND, of Georgia. Under the arrangement which has been made I am to have five minutes, of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania may have as much as he likes.

Mr. CURTIN. I thank the gentleman from Georgia. We were

enemies once; we are friends now. I thank you, my brother. [Great applause.] It is said we are in no danger from having among us this race of Chinamen, with their obedience to centuries of a civilization not in harmony with ours; with language, habits, religion, tradition, and educated, trained, and in the practice of gross sensual morality which surely the most ardent advocate of our duty to all mankind could not wish to have injected into the moral habits and lives of the American people. Mr. Speaker, early in our history we tried the assimilation of a race of different traditions, habits, and faith. Those of our ancestors who first settled this country found the Indian, the man of the forest, the owner of the soil, and they offered to him our civilization and he refused to accept it. They gave him their vices, because we must be permitted to suppose they had them to spare. I do not know that they offered him their virtues. I am glad they did not, because the generation now present needs all that kind of legacy our ancestors left to us. [Laughter.]

Who now will pretend to say that it is not better that this great continent should be peopled by civilized men than by the barbarian men found here? I say, sir, they refused to accept our civilization, and the great wave of civilization rolled over them. It has bridged our rivers, tilled our fields, surmounted mountains—bored through where it could not surmount—felled the forest, turned the virgin soil of the prairies to the living light of the sun and subjected it to the uses of humanity, and in its progress at every step rose the school-house and the church, providing for advancement in all the ways that lead to a national supremacy in all fair business and prosperity. The Indian neither would accept it nor move upon it, and it rolled over him; and the poor barbarian is fast fading before the mighty march of the civilization of the western continent. There is the end of one race.

Mr. Speaker, in passing through the Rotunda of this Capitol a few days since, I looked over its vastness in admiration of its just proportions and great beauty, and symbolizing, in crowning this magnificent pile, the advance in power, art, and culture, the march of a mighty people, noticing around its base the record in the crude art of our earlier national life of the great events of the beginning of our history; and there, sir, above the periods in history told in paint is the history of the Indian race. Over the northern door of the entrance to the Rotunda the Indian is presented as receiving the white man and extending to him the hand of friendship. Over the eastern door the Indian gives the white man corn. Over the western door in mercy, an attribute of deity, the Indian maiden falls upon the prostrate Englishman who was the robber of her father, a great forest king, pleads for his life, and in mercy his life is spared. And over the door leading to this Chamber the white man kills the Indian. Sir, the story is told in imperishable stone. It is the history of a race, put in the Capitol of a great people by whom destroyed, whether to our glory or our shame the future historian, who will deal with us as we deal with those who have preceded us in the lives of nations, will tell; and if history is philosophy teaching by example, we may not be exempt from the destinies of nations.

When we contemplate the ages yet to come, when it may be possible that all the prosperity that now surrounds this great people, this magnificent pile shall crumble down to earth and the records of the great events of our early history in the crude art of the time are lost to the magnificent dome so just in its proportions, so symbolical of our wonderful progress, a learned archaeologist may come and there may find amid its ruins the history of a mythical people preserved in stone, placed in the Capitol by a superior race; a history certain and imperishable as the Assyrian marble or the Egyptian granite, which record the uncertain history of races long since decayed and lost. There, sir, we record the end of one race. I have to speak, sir, if I have the time, of another race. Shall I be spared a little time with the patience of this House to speak of the negro race? [Cries of "Go on!"]

The negro was taken from his native home. He was not consulted as to his immigration, he was forced to become a native of this country. When dealing with the negro race the gentleman from Massachusetts must forget the sublime sentiments of the Declaration of Independence, for the negro was here then and a slave; forget the advanced humanity and Christianity of the liberty-loving people who settled that sterile portion of the United States, that cold region and inhospitable soil, which, in its progress, has so marked the thrift and industry and intelligence of the race of men it has produced, of the great part their illustrious statesmen have borne in every step in our progress and in the very foundation of our matchless Constitution. Sir, it was not the humanitarian principle of which the gentleman speaks that brought the negro; those who did it eliminated all the teaching of their lives. They forgot their free civil and religious sentiment and the introduction of the negro from Africa to this country was the use of power, the practice of unjustifiable wrong, moral degradation, and the instinct of iron-souled cupidity.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. PAGE. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, [Mr. CANNON.]

Mr. CURTIN. I would be very much obliged if the gentleman would allow me a little more time.

Mr. PAGE. I have no objection if the gentleman can proceed by unanimous consent.

Mr. CURTIN. I shall want but a few minutes.

Mr. PAGE. I am willing the gentleman shall go on if the additional time is not to be taken out of my hour.

Mr. CAMP. I object.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman from California [Mr. PAGE] has promised to yield me five minutes. I will give to the gentleman from Pennsylvania whatever portion of my time he may desire to occupy.

Mr. PAGE. I have already yielded my time liberally. I have no objection, of course, to the gentleman from Illinois yielding his time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CURTIN. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his courtesy. Instinctively the negro moved to the South. There he had the genial warmth of the sun, so natural and necessary to his race. At a propitious era in the history of this people Whitney invented the cotton-gin, and introduced a measure of prosperity quite unknown to any portion of this country in the past, and added to the wealth of the nation and to the ease and comfort of his owner. The negro made the southern portion of the United States fruitful and prosperous.

Who, Mr. Speaker, can refer to the history of that race in this country without emotions of sorrow for the past and apprehensions for the future? We are all familiar with it. It is a lesson we have all learned and know only too well. Year by year the problem of African slavery in this country grew upon us. It engaged the attention of our wisest and most skillful statesmen. It strengthened with the coming years, and finally the question was settled in the blood of more than 750,000 of our people. Strong, useful, intellectual men bit the dust. Untold millions of treasure were spent in the struggle which affected the business, the commerce, and the sentiments of the civilized world. The contest ended with the freedom of the negro. He was raised to manhood, and to-day he stands the equal of the white man before the law and one of the common humanity of this great country.

The negro is our legacy. The disturbing element of his bondage in American politics is gone forever. That era, sir, is fast fading into forgetfulness—would to God we could erase it from our history and from our memories! And yet since my presence in this Hall I have taken courage for the future when I notice the mingling of men together on this floor who struggled in battle, the halting gait and maimed bodies of members of this House; ay, sir, more. When I listened the other day to the speech of the eloquent gentleman from Mississippi, [Mr. HOOKER,] noticed the beauty and perfection of his sentences and the depth and power and force of his classic allusions, utterances of the gentleman which attracted the profound attention of this House, there was more appeal to me, sir, in the mute eloquence of the wave of his armless sleeve than in all the beauty and power and fascination of his language. It brought to me the consolation that we were once at peace and that true liberty founded on unity, concord, and fraternity was now present, and to grow and increase forever and forever. [Great applause.]

What the true philosophy of the future of the negro race in this country may be no man has yet been wise enough to predict, for reasons which are acceptable and convincing to those who study and reflect upon the momentous question. In his native country the negro never built a highway, and he never engaged in commerce or trade. He never made a tangible religious faith which consoled him living or gave hopes for the future, or raised a temple to a deity. He never learned to build for himself a house, to manufacture, or to invent, and scarcely knew how to make clothing to cover his nakedness. He inhabited a country of great rivers and extensive forests, a land of great productiveness; a healthy climate with all the surroundings and appointments of beneficent Providence, and yet he lived without a language or an alphabet, without history or tradition. He was a barbarian then, and he remains in the ignorance and superstition of a barbarian still.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with five or six millions of that race in this country—a race now our wards—our first duty as a Christian people will be performed in giving them all the enlightenment they will accept, all the teaching in our power. Having raised them to manhood we must instruct them in the principles of our Government, the value of the rights they have acquired, and instill into them our religious faith, and it may be in the mysteries of Providence that Ethiopia, the country of their home, may open her arms to the light and knowledge of civilization which we have given to those of her unfortunate and unhappy race who were forced among us and who are now the wards of this great nation. If our duty to this race is performed, as I trust and hope it shall be, we may condone the first crime of bringing them here, and they may contribute to the future prosperity of our country. But the fact cannot be concealed that there are many patriotic and learned and wise men who look with apprehension to future disturbance from that element in our political organization.

Mr. Speaker, having disposed of one race, and in the disposition of the Indian we cannot have very great pride in that part of our history; and having another race entirely foreign to the Caucasian people here, over whom we have assumed protection, to whom we propose to give enlightenment and knowledge, until we have made some disposition of them, or incorporated them so firmly into the body-politic that we need apprehend no disturbance from them in the future, I do not think that we should try another experiment with a race quite as dissimilar with an older civilization, surrounded by caste,

by prejudice, speaking in a foreign tongue, who refuse to assimilate in any respect with us, and are no part of the body-politic, and who never will be; and inasmuch as the portion of our people where they live do not want them and are wronged and injured by their presence, it is the part of justice to our State and the assertion of our sovereignty, independent of sentiment and in harmony with our interests, to exclude them.

Mr. Speaker, there were before the war affinities between the negro man and the white man in the South which we have never understood at the North. The white man at the South would be the companion of the negro, admit him to his house, join in his pleasures, find satisfaction in his society, because between the white man and the black man the law raised a distinction, broad, distinct, well known and understood by both. With us in the North the distinction between the white man and the black man was only a social distinction, and it remains a social distinction still, and the distinction between the races has not been broken by the ballot. If the negro man of the South, having been raised to an equality with the white man, is to be advanced by that equality to a higher plane of civilization and learning; if he is to learn the duty of obedience to the Government, of the support of its laws, and through the blessings of freedom and equality, the white man of the South is his proper teacher, because between the white man of the South and the negro man of the South there are friendships and affiliations which are not understood in the North; and I have failed to understand the character of the Southern white man if he is not inclined to make the most of the negro race that he can, and surely inspired by the affinities of which I have spoken the colored man of the South will find in the white man his true friend. If it is not his sentiment, it is his interest. And, sir, with the knowledge, the satisfactory knowledge, that the intellectual stature of the negro man has been improved by his condition of freedom, and without apprehensions of disturbance from that element in the near future, I am inspired by the hope that all that is expected by the highest and most expansive philanthropy will be accomplished in that hitherto degraded and unhappy people.

I have said, Mr. Speaker, that it is a common and favorite topic, however sincere, to speak of labor, and very much has been said of its power and its demands for just protection by and through the Government. This Government should give protection to the laboring classes in any enactment of this Congress. The object of previous legislation has generally been the protection of capital, and the protection of their interests the incident. Sir, we have given away empires to corporations. We raise subsidies. We extend the credit of our Government to assist centralized and incorporated capital, and we protect the products of our own ingenuity and industry by imposing duties on foreign competition when we raise revenue. Of that I do not complain, because I know capital offers enterprises in which labor will find employment and pay. And, sir, if the centralization of power and of capital, which I must not think that American citizens look upon with satisfaction for the future of this country, and if we do not direct the legislation made to the protection of all classes engaged in and necessary to develop our resources in which capital is invited to active employment we fail in our duty. There should be perfect harmony between capital and labor. One is dependent upon the other; and it must be remembered that capital is much more able to take care of the interest of capital than labor can be of labor. Independently of the Government there is scarcely in this country any of the enterprises or avenues through which capital finds its direction and employs labor where there are not combinations to regulate the supply and demand, provide for markets, and sometimes, I regret to say, fix the price of wages.

When incorporated companies or associated capital can combine to establish prices of production or carriage or the value of labor, or at their pleasure or convenience fix the value of the productions of the farm or the price which shall be paid for the products in our markets or needed in the prosecution of their business, it is not strange, indeed, that we are often disturbed by the restlessness of laborers. My learned and eloquent friend from Mississippi read in the course of his remarks a report made of a farm of thirty thousand acres in California, where Chinamen were employed, in which it was stated that they were patient and obedient workmen and in no danger of strikes; and that no doubt is the testimony of men who employ them, and it is true patience and docility are not characteristics of freemen. If capital can combine labor has the right to reasonable and enlightened association in self-defense. Meetings are constantly occurring all over the country in almost every State at this time by men who earn their living by the sweat of their face, and those who have noticed the proceedings of recent meetings of that character must have noticed with great satisfaction that there is no violence threatened, no intimation of any breach of the law, but they have associated for the purpose of getting the highest possible pay for a fair day's work. They have the right to refuse to work when they believe the compensation inadequate to their necessities unless they are serving under an agreement. They have not the right to interfere with the rights or interests of others and their enjoyment of the blessings of our Government, or to destroy property, nor, as I understand the proceedings, do they claim the right to prevent or interfere with others who desire to work when they refuse, because then they are in violation of the law, as the rights of others have intervened. I cannot but regard the recent proceedings and utterances of workmen as tend-

ing to an intelligent understanding between labor and capital and to their mutual prosperity.

Now, sir, it is not likely to occur, but it is possible to bring 50,000 Chinamen from California and settle them down in Massachusetts, at Lowell or Lynn or Fall River or other enterprising towns, where they are as busy as bees in their productive industries, and thus displace 50,000 Massachusetts workmen and laborers. I apprehend the enlightened workmen who now make the flourishing cities I have mentioned so prosperous and yield such plentiful returns to the capital invested in their manufacturing establishments, I apprehend, sir, that strikes might be expected, and John Chinaman would not fare better, or as well, in the land and under the protection of the steady habits and exalted political ideas of the Puritan; and the violent denunciation of the enlightened Yankee orator would dwarf into harmless inane prattle, the crude oratory of the shambles and the sand-lots of California. [Laughter and loud applause.] Then, sir, they would scarcely entertain the sympathy that now goes out with such generosity, and in the expression of which their members on this floor are so eloquent, toned and beautified by the perfection of their language.

If, then, the introduction of forty or fifty thousand Chinamen would interfere with the rights or the interests or happiness or ability to work in New England, where so much of their prosperity depends on labor, we have the right, nay, it is our duty when the people of a great State, one of the great sovereignties which make up our Government, ask for relief, to grant it if in our power. If New England could not tolerate such an invasion, and the Chinaman in thousands should be carried to the South by capital, seeking cheap labor; or if he should go there to a climate adapted to his nature and work and production, in harmony with his life and teachings, what would become of the colored man, and what of the poor white man of that section? Who would inflict such a grievous wrong on the black man, the ward of the nation, and take from him the interests, the teachings, and sympathy of the white man, his real friend? Such a calamity is not to be for a moment contemplated to the colored man of this nation.

I will most heartily give my vote for this bill; and accepting the principle as admitted by all the gentlemen who have discussed this question that we have the right to put a limitation on the immigration of the Chinese people under the treaty with that nation, a question I need not now discuss, I will vote for twenty years' suspension of immigration, because, first, we assert the right; we believe the representations made by all the people of the Pacific coast to be true, and they are our own people, and as they are the best judges of the limitations as to time, I yield any judgment I might have to the better judgment of those who should understand this question. When we concede to their judgment we give it force and effect by our legislation in this Congress. [Great applause.]

Mr. PAGE. I now yield for ten minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Speaker, in my ten minutes I shall seek to speak on the question before the House, if I can find out what it is. And in the commencement I want to state that I have heard no man on either side of this Chamber who denies the power and the right to suspend the immigration of Chinese laborers to the United States. If there be a man on either side who does deny it I will pause and let him rise in his place and make such denial.

I will go further, Mr. Speaker. I have yet to hear the man on either side of the House who is not willing to vote for restrictions and regulations and suspension of the immigration of Chinese laborers, making a difference between Chinese and other foreign immigration. If there be any who do not assent to this proposition I will pause and let them get up and say so.

I state further, I have yet to hear anybody say on the floor of this House that he will not vote for this bill, provided you strike out the word "twenty" and insert "ten." If there is a man in this House other than the gentleman from Kentucky, I will let him get up and state so. [Several members rose.] Yes, there is one, two, three, four, five, six—the woods are full of them, says the gentleman from Vermont, [Mr. JOYCE.]

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman from Illinois will find when the question is taken upon this bill how members stand on it, and on this twenty years' clause particularly.

Mr. CANNON. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the roll-call will show, and I have been trying so far in my remarks to find out if I can the points in the proposed legislation about which we are not all agreed. [Several members rose.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is entitled to the floor.

Mr. CANNON. I am entitled, I believe, to be heard during my time, and it is now less than ten minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it is agreed upon all hands that some regulation, limitation, or suspension of this immigration should be had, and that, too, by legislative enactment. It is further agreed that such suspension should be reasonable. I will direct my remarks for a few minutes to the reasonableness of the proposed legislation.

Two years ago we passed a bill regulating Chinese immigration, and the same was vetoed by the then President, Hayes, upon the ground that it violated the then existing treaty between the United States and China. The President, in response to the demand of the

people proceeded to make a new treaty with China, which was concluded in November, 1880, and ratified and proclaimed in October, 1881. The object of the new treaty was to enable the United States to suspend the immigration of Chinese laborers. I read from the treaty:

Whereas the Government of the United States, because of the constantly increasing immigration of Chinese laborers to the territory of the United States, and the embarrassments consequent upon such immigration, now desires to negotiate a modification of the existing treaties which shall not be in direct contravention of their spirit:

Now, therefore, &c.

Then follow articles 1 and 2:

ARTICLE I.

Whenever, in the opinion of the Government of the United States, the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States, or their residence therein, affects or threatens to affect the interests of that country, or to endanger the good order of the said country, or of any locality within the territory thereof, the Government of China agrees that the Government of the United States may regulate, limit, or suspend such coming or residence, but may not absolutely prohibit it. The limitation or suspension shall be reasonable, and shall apply only to Chinese who may go to the United States as laborers, other classes not being included in the limitations. Legislation taken in regard to Chinese laborers will be of such a character only as is necessary to enforce the regulation, limitation, or suspension of immigration, and immigrants shall not be subject to personal maltreatment or abuse.

ARTICLE II.

Chinese subjects, whether proceeding to the United States as teachers, students, merchants, or from curiosity, together with their body and household servants, and Chinese laborers who are now in the United States shall be allowed to go and come of their own free will and accord, and shall be accorded all the rights, privileges, immunities, and exemptions which are accorded to the citizens and subjects of the most favored nation.

Observe the language of article 1:

Whenever in the opinion of the Government of the United States the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States * * * affects or threatens to affect the interests of that country, or to endanger the good order of the said country or of any locality within the territory thereof, the Government of China agrees that the Government of the United States may regulate, limit, or suspend such coming or residence. * * * The limitation or suspension shall be reasonable.

The United States, under this provision, is the only judge as to whether the interests of the country or of any locality are unduly threatened, and has full power to make any regulation or limitation, and may go further and suspend such coming, and there is no limit to the power of regulation, limitation, or suspension, excepting that the same shall be reasonable.

Now, this legislation does not seek to affect the status of the Chinese now here. On the contrary, it protects them in their right of leaving and returning again, but does suspend for twenty years, if the law should not be sooner repealed, the coming of additional Chinese laborers to the United States.

Now, the only question that anybody raises is as to the reasonableness of such suspension. To determine this we should look at the condition of our own country, our civilization, manners, and customs, and the numbers, habits, and civilization of the Chinese. If there were no Chinese in this country, then a suspension for twenty years of their immigration would not be reasonable; but there are, as shown by the census of 1880, 105,000 Chinese in the United States, over 75,000 of whom are in California, and the most of the balance in Oregon, Nevada, Idaho, and Washington Territory.

All agree that the Chinese are unlike any other immigrants to this country. The Norwegians, Swedes, Germans, Irish, English, and Scotch who find a home within our borders soon become, they and their descendants, in custom, language, and sympathy, part and parcel of the American people. They marry and are given in marriage. They help to support churches, schools, and in every way assist in working out advantageously their and our destiny; while the Chinese retain their language, manners, customs, allegiance to their emperor; they neither marry nor are given in marriage; they do not help to bear the burdens of state; they do not assist in the building of churches or school-houses; they are Chinese when they come, Chinese while they remain, and Chinese when they return. Our people cannot compete with them in labor where they are to be found in large numbers, for they are without the burdens of the family and do not bear the burdens of society, and will thrive upon wages where an American citizen who performs his duty and lives by the sweat of his face would starve at the same wages.

All this has very justly, for the past thirty years, upon the Pacific slope and elsewhere in the country among thinking people, aroused antagonism against the Chinese; and in some instances, as is natural, leading to persecution, ill-treatment, and sometimes amounting to cruelty.

We have to-day at least 120,000 adult Chinese, substantially all males. A like number of American laborers would represent a population of five times their number. In other words, while the 120,000 Chinese have only themselves to support, 120,000 American laborers have four times their own number, including the women and children, to take care of out of the proceeds of their labor. This does not give the Americans, who own this country, a fair chance.

This bill, under the treaty, in good faith permits these Chinese to remain, or to return to China and again come to the United States. But it suspends the further coming of Chinese laborers for twenty years. For thirty years the Chinese have refused to conform to our customs and adopt our civilization, and it is believed that for twenty years to come those now here will adhere to their customs. If, however, at the end of ten years, or twenty years, the Chinese now here will make themselves worthy of American citizenship, making our

country their country, and our civilization their civilization, then we can safely permit others to come. And it is not unreasonable that we should say to these Asiatics, who are in the main servile laborers, that they shall not further be admitted.

Mr. Speaker, a government in which the laborers are the sovereigns cannot with safety permit a segment of people who are not qualified and will not qualify themselves for citizenship and sovereignty to be planted in their midst.

Sir, it was only last week that we practically, by an act of Congress, abolished the then existing Territorial government of Utah, and deprived substantially of citizenship all persons practicing polygamy within the borders of that Territory. They are not Chinese but Anglo-Saxons; but our civilization, as was once so eloquently said by another, rests upon the family and clusters about the hearthstone. And when Anglo-Saxon polygamists in any part of our territory subvert our laws and threaten our civilization, it is but right and proper, in defense of that civilization and of our form of government, that they should be robbed of power at the ballot-box and held amenable to the laws.

Why, sir, the late civil war was begotten by the instinct of self-preservation in the breasts of the American laborers. They felt that labor done by slaves, when brought into competition with labor done by freemen, did not elevate the slave laborer but degraded the free laborer. And after the war closed, and slavery was abolished, notwithstanding the want of education in the ways of citizenship upon the part of the late slaves, our people felt that in a free country we could not afford to have four millions of people who did not participate in the Government; that they would not be safe; that we would not be safe. And while it was admitted that many of them were not fully competent to exercise the right of sovereignty, it was believed there was less of peril to the Republic in conferring upon them the right of sovereignty than in having so large an element living among us subject to our laws and debarred from the highest privileges of citizenship.

But it is claimed that the Chinese will qualify themselves for citizenship. In reply I only state that they have not in the last thirty years. I do not underrate them. They come of a race that has existed through all ages. Their civilization is substantially the same now that it was many thousands of years ago. And the very qualities which enabled them to maintain their civilization, which is not our civilization, keeps them from easily changing and assimilating with us.

It is said we need more labor in this country. That is granted. There is room enough for two or three times as large a population as we now have, but if the Republic endures it must be a homogeneous population.

I want to state, Mr. Speaker, here and now, that it is not only our right but our duty to suspend the coming of all people from China or from anywhere else who will not, in good faith, cast their lot with us, and help bear our burdens and perpetuate our civilization.

But it is said we do not feel any inconvenience in New England and Illinois or east of the Rocky Mountains from Chinese immigration. Yet it is our duty; and the Federal power is the only power that can protect any and all of the States from this or any other immigration. The State has no power in the premises, and it is as much our duty under the Constitution, the laws, and the treaty to protect California and the Pacific slope as if the immigration extended throughout the whole country. It is easy for some people to be liberal and sentimental so long as it is at the expense of somebody else.

I call attention to the fact that of the 50,000,000 of people in this country six and a half millions in round numbers are of foreign birth and 6,000,000 colored. In California there are in round numbers over 860,000 people. The census of 1880 shows that 75,000 of this population are Chinese—about one-eleventh of the whole population. Maine, in 1880, had within her borders 8 Chinese, where she would have had 60,000 had she had the same percentage of Chinese as California. Massachusetts had 229, where she would have had 160,000 with like percentage as California. Illinois had 209, and would have had 260,000 with equal percentage to California. Of course we have not felt directly the evil influences of this immigration, but when it is recollected that China teems with a population of 400,000,000 I submit that not for the Pacific slope alone, but wise statesmanship demands that for the whole country this immigration should be suspended.

To me, Mr. Speaker, this is not an open question. It has been considered by the whole American people and especially by the Republican party. The Republican platform of 1880, containing a declaration of policies we believed in and upon which we elected Garfield and Arthur, contains the following:

Since the authority to regulate immigration and intercourse between the United States and foreign nations rests with Congress, or with the United States and its treaty-making powers, the Republican party, regarding the unrestricted immigration of the Chinese as an evil of great magnitude, invokes the exercise of those powers to restrain and limit that immigration by the enactment of such just, humane, and reasonable provisions as will produce that result.

That far-seeing statesman, the late President, in his letter of acceptance, in speaking of this question, used the following language:

The material interests of this country, the traditions of its settlement, and the sentiment of our people have led the Government to offer the widest hospitality to

emigrants who seek our shores for new and happier homes, willing to share the burdens as well as the benefits of our society, and intending that their posterity shall become an undistinguishable part of our population. The recent movement of the Chinese to our Pacific coast partakes but little of the qualities of such an immigration, either in its purposes or result. It is too much like an importation to be welcomed without restriction; too much like an invasion to be looked upon without solicitude. We cannot consent to allow any form of servile labor to be introduced among us under the guise of immigration.

I have only to say that we were upon these and other pledges intrusted with power, and it is now our privilege, and in my opinion our duty, to carry out this policy by legislation. To my mind the proposed legislation is reasonable, and I for one shall vote for the bill.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. Speaker, in the little time remaining I will answer as briefly as I may some of the points made against this bill.

Mr. ROBESON. I would like to ask the gentleman from California to yield me five minutes.

Mr. PAGE. I would like to accommodate my friend from New Jersey, but I have only seventeen minutes of my time left, and if that time belonged to me I would cheerfully give it to my friend. But 1,000,000 of people on the Pacific coast demand that their representatives shall be heard in this the closing hour of this debate. I regret, also, that I have not the time now to answer some of the remarks made upon this side of the House, and also upon the other side by the gentleman from Mississippi.

What has all the debate been about for the last two weeks? We are considering a bill to restrict Chinese immigration and to carry into effect a solemn treaty made between the United States and the Chinese Empire. The bill under consideration provides twenty years shall be the limit of the suspension of this immigration. Gentlemen come here and say they do not want twenty years; that is too long a time; that is an unreasonable time, but they will accept ten years. They say that ten years is a reasonable limitation and twenty years is an unreasonable limitation. Did they ever reflect that San Francisco sits almost beneath the shadow of the Chinese Empire, which contains a population of between four and five hundred millions; that San Francisco is so situated that you can put down there a shipload of Chinese slaves at \$24 a head—cheaper than you can go from here to Chicago? That is the reason why a limitation of ten years is unreasonable. You have to do something more for a people that for thirty years have been suffering from contact with Chinese coolly slaves.

Gentlemen would seek to amend this bill. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KASSON] comes here with an amendment; but under the cloak and garb of an amendment to this bill methinks there lurks the dagger of an assassin, to stab it to the death. He says, "Only admit this amendment to allow one little Chinaman to come across from Canada to take a place as a domestic servant." That amendment, Mr. Speaker, would prevent the law absolutely from being enforced in a court of justice in the United States. And though I have no right to judge of men's motives, I think I am entitled to believe there is a persistent and united determination upon the part of those who oppose this bill to force upon it amendments that will destroy it. I am afraid there is more railroad and monopoly than there is sentiment in this opposition. I witnessed a scene the other night, when I saw one of the hired lobbyists of corporate power walk in and congratulate a member who had spoken against and denounced this bill. The Six Chinese Companies have their agents in this city, occupying every corner of this Capitol for weeks. [Mr. WHITE rose.] There is not so much sentiment when you come to investigate it as some of our honorable friends would make you believe. I hear that two great companies have united their corporate power to defeat this bill upon this floor; and I say, Mr. Speaker, that I hope this bill will be passed without amendment.

Mr. WHITE. I rise to a point of order. I call the gentleman from California to order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky will state his point of order.

Mr. WHITE. I undertake to say, Mr. Speaker, that the words of the gentlemen from California are altogether too far-reaching when he undertakes to say—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky must state his point of order.

Mr. WHITE. My point of order is this: that those opposed to this bill are opposed to it for the reasons the gentleman from California was proceeding to give, and which the RECORD will show. I denounce as utterly false and unworthy to be stated by any gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky rose to a point of order, as he stated, and undertook to make a point of order and proceeds to be out of order himself.

Mr. WHITE. I do not desire to be that. My point of order is—

The SPEAKER, (rapping with the gavel.) The gentleman from Kentucky will cease—

Mr. WHITE. I desire, Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky is not in order.

Mr. WHITE. Can I not state, with all deference to the Chair, that the gentleman from California is undertaking—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Kentucky he had a right to call the gentleman from California to order

and state the point on which he called him to order. But the gentleman from Kentucky had no right to proceed to debate and had no right to use unparliamentary language in doing so.

Mr. WHITE. I do not desire to debate, but I simply desire to say this, that the gentleman from California ought not to undertake to speak for others.

The SPEAKER. The point of order of the gentleman from Kentucky is not sustained.

Mr. ATKINS. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ATKINS. Is this unnecessary interruption to be taken out of the time of the gentleman from California?

The SPEAKER. It is not.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think some notice should be taken of the unparliamentary language of the gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. WHITE.]

Mr. PAGE. Oh, no; I hope not. I hope the House will not take any notice of it at all.

Mr. WHITE. I insist on calling the gentleman from California to order. He has imputed to gentlemen on this side of the House who are opposing the bill improper motives.

The SPEAKER rapped to order and said: The gentleman from Kentucky is out of order. The Chair has already stated the point of order made against the gentleman from California is not sustained. The gentleman from California [Mr. PAGE] will proceed.

Mr. PAGE. I was proceeding to say when I was interrupted there were other amendments to this bill that were sought to be incorporated therein. Gentlemen desire to strike out the sixteenth and seventeenth sections.

The sixteenth section of the bill defines what in the meaning of the treaty a "laborer" is. That definition was not in the original bill. It was put in by the Senate. I see no reason why it should be stricken out, because it would seem the word "laborer" is not broad enough to cover what is intended, and that definition does include all that is intended to be included in the bill.

It is also proposed to strike out the seventeenth section. The object of the seventeenth section is simply to prevent the Chinese from becoming naturalized citizens of the United States. Now, it is well understood under the law that Chinese cannot become naturalized citizens. In 1866, when the Senator from Massachusetts (Charles Sumner) reported a bill to amend the naturalization laws by striking out the word "white," an amendment was inserted which made it apply only to white male citizens above the age of twenty-one and persons of African nativity and descent, and therefore by implication excluded the Asiatics. I see no reason why this House should desire to put itself upon record as in favor of striking out of this bill the seventeenth section, which follows the law and declares the judgment of American Representatives that the Chinese are unfit to become naturalized citizens of the United States.

I would like to have answered in detail some of the arguments made in opposition to this bill by gentlemen who have preceded me. There is the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. RICE,] and I respect him very highly for the kindness he has always shown me on this floor, but I must say that I do not understand where he got the idea that the party of the Pacific coast were the "left wing" of the Republican party. Let me tell that gentleman that in 1876 they were the right wing of the party, when one electoral vote from the State of Oregon was given for Hayes and made him President, at the time the eyes of our friends east were turned westward to see whether the vote of Cronin from Oregon would be admitted or not.

I desire, however, to refer more particularly to some remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. TAYLOR,] the successor of our late President, James A. Garfield. In that connection I desire to state that while I know he represents on this floor one of the most patriotic and wealthy Republican districts in the United States, yet I stand here as an American citizen to say that the doctrines which he enunciated have been repudiated by the people of this country, and by his illustrious predecessor.

The gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. TAYLOR,] speaking of the Chinaman, said, "He comes here and sells his labor, which is worth twice as much as he gets for it;" and therefore he argues that he ought to be admitted into the country by the people of the United States. But what said James A. Garfield on that subject? However, I will first read the celebrated Morey letter:

Yours in relation to the Chinese problem came duly to hand.

I take it that the question of employes is only a question of private and corporate economy, and individuals or companies have the right to buy labor where they can get it cheapest.

We have a treaty with the Chinese Government, which should be religiously kept until its provisions are abrogated by the action of the General Government, and I am not prepared to say that it should be abrogated until our great manufacturing and corporate interests are conserved in the matter of labor.

That was a bald and black-hearted forgery, and every Republican in the United States so declared it. Yet what does the successor of James A. Garfield on this floor say on this subject? He says that the Chinese come here to sell their labor, and that they have a right to do so. But what did General Garfield say in his letter to Hon. Marshal Jewell, the chairman of the Republican national committee? I will read it:

DEAR SIR: In my dispatches of yesterday and this evening (which are also sent you by mail) I have denounced the Morey letter as a base forgery. Its stupid and

brutal sentiments I never expressed nor entertained. The lithographic copy shows a very clumsy attempt to imitate my penmanship and signature. Any one who is familiar with my handwriting will instantly see that the letter is spurious.

I place on record side by side the declaration of James A. Garfield, late President, and the utterance of his successor here, who says that the Chinaman comes here to sell his labor, and therefore his coming is right and proper.

In conclusion let me appeal, and it is the last appeal that perhaps I shall ever make to the American people as a Representative on this floor for the passage of a bill like this. I have been here now for nearly ten years. I have served out the allotted term generally given to Representatives from most of the States. I believe I have been conscientious in obeying the wishes of my constituents, in pleading for the passage of a bill to relieve them from this terrible evil of Chinese immigration.

I appeal to this side of the House, with which I have always acted. Every time there has been a measure brought forward for the enfranchisement of any of the people of this country, declaring for the largest liberty to all its citizens, the people I represent and I myself have always marched beneath the grand banner of the Republican party. And you owe it to yourselves to-day to pass this bill. You owe it to the pledges you made in national convention, when you declared that Chinese immigration was an evil of great magnitude, and that some remedial legislation should be passed for its removal. You owe it to the departed President of the United States, whose memory you must defend, as was done when the sentiments of the forged Morey letter were denounced by every Republican in the land. Yet, worse sentiments have been uttered on this floor in favor of Chinese immigration than were contained in the Morey letter. Not satisfied with striking out "twenty" and inserting "ten" as the term of suspension, they want to naturalize these Chinamen. The gentleman from Iowa has submitted a proposition to naturalize these people under certain conditions.

Is this the manner in which the Republican party is going to keep its pledges? Is this the way you are going to treat the people who come here and demand legislation for their relief? When they ask you for bread will you give them a stone? Are you going to reduce the time of this suspension, and then emasculate the bill by further amendments? I hope not. I trust and believe the better judgment of this House will give us, when they come to vote on this bill, a measure which will meet the wants and the requirements of the people of the Pacific coast.

It has been suggested to me that I could not have meant what I said when I said that corporate power was opposing this bill. I said so, and I now repeat it. I never intended to say that any member of this House had been reached by the influence of that corporate power. Nothing in my remarks would justify anybody in supposing that I meant that. I simply said what I know and what you gentlemen know to be true. You know that the agent of the Six Companies is here; and gentlemen know his name as well as I do. He is soliciting members to vote against this bill, and has tried to come before our committee to oppose the bill after it had passed the committee.

Several MEMBERS. Name him.

Mr. PAGE. His name is Kennedy.

Mr. WHITE. I have never heard of him.

Mr. PAGE. There are many things you have never heard of. I do not say and never intended to say that any member upon this floor has been approached and had his judgment improperly controlled upon this measure.

But, Mr. Speaker, I repeat that those monopolies engaged in the carrying trade, and deriving immense profits from the coming of Chinese laborers to this country and their remaining here, are all in favor of leaving this immigration unrestricted. They would enslave you, if it suited their purpose, as they would enslave these Chinese. The men who clamor loudest now for Chinese cheap labor on the Pacific coast are only waiting and preparing their weapons when they will demand free trade, and get it too. They will demand free trade in order that the ports of the United States shall be opened to the commerce of the world, so that they can bring here Chinese goods manufactured there more cheaply than the labor of American citizens can produce them.

Let me say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that out of the 162,000 voters on the Pacific coast 90 per cent. are workmen, men who labor with their hands. Their unanimous appeal comes to you to-day. They turn to this grand party that for the last twenty years has fought the battles of the downtrodden and oppressed, they turn to this party that always keeps its promises, this party with its grand and noble record, and as their last hope they say, "Give us this bill, remove this obstruction from our progress, invite European immigration to the Pacific coast, but do not allow us to be overrun by Asiatic immigration."

Mr. Speaker, I once heard a conundrum—"Where is the best place to have a boil?" And the answer was: "On somebody else's nose." [Laughter.] So it appears to be the principle here with gentlemen from the East, that the best place to have Chinese immigration is on the Pacific coast. In the East they do not want it. If 10,000 of these Chinese laborers were in the city of Boston to-day there would be a riot in forty-eight hours; if 25,000 of them were in the city of Philadelphia there would be a riot in twenty-four hours. My time

has expired; and I commend the bill to the House, confidently believing it will pass and become a law, and when it does our people will rise up and call you blessed.

The SPEAKER. The debate is now closed. The previous question having been ordered on the bill and pending amendments, the first amendment to be voted on, as the Chair understands, is that offered by the gentleman from Iowa, [Mr. KASSON,] to strike out, in the first section of the bill, the word "twenty," before the word "years," and insert in lieu thereof the word "ten."

Mr. SPRINGER. I rise to a question of order. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] has moved an amendment to strike out "twenty" and insert "fifteen." I think that should be treated as an amendment to this amendment.

The SPEAKER. It was not offered as an amendment to the amendment, and the vote will be reached just as promptly by treating it as a separate proposition. The question is now on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa to strike out "twenty" in the first section and insert "ten."

Mr. CONVERSE. On that question I call for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BRUMM. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I understand that the amendment we are now to vote upon is that offered by the gentleman from Iowa, [Mr. KASSON,] I also understand that since this amendment was offered the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] has moved an amendment (which would probably be an amendment to this amendment) making the period for the suspension of this immigration fifteen years. My question is whether we should not vote first on the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio?

The SPEAKER. These were offered as independent amendments, and that of the gentleman from Iowa is first in order. The Clerk will proceed with the call.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 100, nays 131, not voting 61; as follows:

YEAS—100.

Aldrich,	Ford,	Lord,	Shallenberger,
Anderson,	Hall,	McCoid,	Shultz,
Barr,	Hammond, John	McCook,	Skinner,
Bragg,	Harris, Benj. W.	McKinley,	Smith, Dietrich C.
Briggs,	Haskell,	Morey,	Smith, J. Hyatt
Browne,	Hawk,	Norcross,	Spooner,
Buck,	Henderson,	O'Neill,	Stone,
Burrows, Julius C.	Hepburn,	Orth,	Strait,
Camp,	Hill,	Parker,	Taylor,
Candler,	Hiscock,	Payson,	Thompson, Wm. G.
Carpenter,	Hooker,	Peelle,	Townsend, Amos
Caswell,	Horr,	Pound,	Tyler,
Chace,	Houk,	Ranney,	Updegraff, J. T.
Cornell,	Hubbell,	Ray,	Updegraff, Thomas
Crapo,	Humphrey,	Reed,	Urner,
Cullen,	Jacobs,	Rice, John B.	Wadsworth,
Dawes,	Jones, George W.	Rice, Theron M.	Wait,
Deering,	Jones, Phineas	Rice, William W.	Walker,
De Motte,	Jorgensen,	Rich,	Ward,
Dingley,	Joyce,	Ritchie,	Watson,
Dunnell,	Kasson,	Robeson,	White,
Dwight,	Kelley,	Robinson, Geo. D.	Williams, Chas. G.
Errett,	Ketcham,	Russell,	Willits,
Farwell, Chas. B.	Lacey,	Ryan,	Wilson,
Farwell, Sewell S.	Lewis,	Scranton,	Wood, Walter A.

NAYS—131.

Aiken,	Darrell,	Holman,	Robinson, Wm. E.
Armfield,	Davidson,	House,	Rosecrans,
Atkins,	Davis, George R.	Hubbs,	Sherwin,
Bayne,	Davis, Lowndes H.	Hutchins,	Simonton,
Belford,	Dezendorf,	Jones, James K.	Singleton, Otho R.
Berry,	Dibble,	Kenna,	Smith, A. Herr
Bingham,	Dibrell,	King,	Sparks,
Blackburn,	Dowd,	Klotz,	Spaulding,
Blanchard,	Dugro,	Knott,	Speer,
Bliss,	Ermentrout,	Ladd,	Springer,
Blount,	Finley,	Leedom,	Stocklager,
Brewer,	Flower,	Manning,	Talbot,
Brumm,	Forney,	Marsh,	Thomas,
Buckner,	Fulkerson,	Martin,	Thompson, P. B.
Burrows, Jos. H.	Garrison,	Matson,	Tillman,
Butterworth,	Geddes,	McClure,	Townsend, R. W.
Cabell,	George,	McKenzie,	Tucker,
Caldwell,	Gibson,	McLane,	Turner, Henry G.
Calkins,	Gunter,	McMillin,	Turner, Oscar
Campbell,	Hammond, N. J.	Miller,	Upson,
Cannon,	Hardenbergh,	Mills,	Valentine,
Cassidy,	Hardy,	Money,	Vance,
Clark,	Harner,	Morse,	Van Horn,
Clements,	Harris, Henry S.	Moulton,	Warner,
Cobb,	Haseltine,	Murch,	Washburn,
Converse,	Hatch,	Mutcher,	Webber,
Cook,	Hazelton,	Pacheco,	Wellborn,
Cox, Samuel S.	Heilman,	Page,	Whitthorne,
Cox, William R.	Herndon,	Paul,	Williams, Thomas
Covington,	Hewitt, Abram S.	Phelps,	Willis,
Cravens,	Hewitt, G. W.	Phister,	Wise, George D.
Culbertson,	Hoblitzell,	Randall,	Wise Morgan R.
Curtin,	Hoge,	Reagan,	

NOT VOTING—61.

Allen,	Bowman,	Cutts,	Grout,
Atherton,	Buchanan,	Deuster,	Guenther,
Barbour,	Carlisle,	Dunn,	Herbert,
Beach,	Chalmers,	Ellis,	Jadwin,
Belmont,	Chapman,	Ewins,	Latham,
Beltzhoover,	Clardy,	Fisher,	Le Fevre
Black,	Colerick,	Frost,	Lindsey,
Bland,	Crowley,	Godshalk,	Mason,

Miles, Moore, Morrison, Mosgrove, Muldrow, Neal, Nolan, Oates,	Pierce, Pettibone, Prescott, Richardson, D. P. Richardson, Jno. S. Robertson, Robinson, Jas. S. Ross,	Scales, Scoville, Shackelford, Shelley, Singleton, Jas. W. Steele, Stephens, Van Aernam,	Van Voorhis, West, Wheeler, Wood, Benjamin, Young.
---	--	---	--

So the amendment was rejected.

During the roll-call the following pairs were announced from the Clerk's desk:

Mr. PIERCE with Mr. BARBOUR.
Mr. GODSHALK with Mr. DUNN.
Mr. BOWMAN with Mr. ALLEN.
Mr. CARLISLE with Mr. LINDSEY.
Mr. MASON with Mr. LATHAM.
Mr. HERBERT with Mr. PETTIBONE.
Mr. CROWLEY with Mr. NOLAN.
Mr. NOLAN, if present, would vote for the bill.
Mr. YOUNG with Mr. LE FEVRE.
Mr. SHELLEY with Mr. PRESCOTT.
Mr. BEACH with Mr. VAN VOORHIS.
Mr. BEACH would vote for the bill.
Mr. SCALES with Mr. ERRETT, which does not include the Chinese bill.
Mr. CUTTS with Mr. MANNING.
Mr. FISHER with Mr. BLAND.
Mr. BLAND would vote for the bill.
Mr. MORRISON with Mr. STEELE.
Mr. WEST with Mr. OATES.
Mr. VAN AERNAM with Mr. SCOVILLE.
Mr. NEAL with Mr. EVINS.
Mr. VAN HORN with Mr. CLARDY.
Mr. CLARDY would vote for the bill.
Mr. RICHARDSON, of New York, with Mr. RICHARDSON, of South Carolina.
Mr. CANNON with Mr. ATKINS.
Mr. STEPHENS with Mr. SINGLETON of Illinois.
Mr. SINGLETON would vote for, and Mr. STEPHENS against, the bill.
Mr. ROSS with Mr. JADWIN.
Mr. ROBESON with Mr. BURROWS of Michigan, on the final vote.
Mr. CUTTS with Mr. COLERICK.
Mr. MANNING. I was paired with Mr. CUTTS, but that has been transferred to Mr. COLERICK.
Mr. ERRETT. I am not paired on this bill, and have voted.
Mr. SCOVILLE. I am paired with Mr. VAN AERNAM. If he were present, I would vote "no."
Mr. MOORE. I am paired with my colleague, Mr. PETTIBONE.
Mr. MULDROW. I am paired with Mr. MILES on all questions except the agricultural bill.
Mr. SINGLETON, of Illinois. If Mr. STEPHENS were present I would vote for the bill.

On motion of Mr. VALENTINE, by unanimous consent, the reading of the names was dispensed with.

The vote was then announced as above recorded.

Mr. PAGE moved to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBINSON] and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER] are identical with the amendment just voted on.

Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts. I withdraw mine.

The SPEAKER. Under the understanding of the House, no vote will be taken on these amendments.

The next amendment is that of the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. BUTTERWORTH,] to strike out "twenty" and insert "fifteen."

The House divided; and there were—ayes 87, noes 99.

Mr. WHITE demanded the yeas and nays and tellers on the yeas and nays.

Tellers were refused, and the yeas and nays were refused.

So the amendment was disagreed to.

Mr. PAGE moved to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The question next recurred on the following amendment, offered by Mr. RICE, of Massachusetts:

In the first section, lines 5 and 6, strike out the words "Chinese laborers" and insert instead thereof the words "contract laborers, known as coolies, criminals, prostitutes, and persons diseased with leprosy or the small-pox, from China."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PAGE moved to reconsider the vote just taken; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The question next recurred on the following amendment of Mr. RICE, of Massachusetts:

In section 1, strike out all of said section including and after the word "suspended" in lines 7 and 8, and insert instead thereof the words "limited to ten thousand annually."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PAGE moved to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The question next recurred on the following amendment moved by Mr. HEPBURN:

Strike out all of the first section after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That from and after the expiration of ninety days after the passage of this act the immigration or importation of all Chinese slaves, or persons held to labor for a term of years, all Chinese criminals, paupers, and diseased persons, be, and the same is hereby prohibited; nor shall it be lawful for any of the classes of persons in this section named to remain in the territory of the United States."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PAGE moved to reconsider the vote just taken; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment, proposed by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KASSON. I ask the Clerk to read from the tenth line, so as to see the connection in which the amendment comes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Nor shall the two foregoing sections apply to the case of any master whose vessel, being bound to a port not within the United States, shall come within the jurisdiction of the United States by reason of being in distress or in stress of weather.

To which the following amendment is proposed:

Add at the end of the section the words:

"Or touching at any port of the United States on its voyage: *Provided*, That all Chinese laborers brought on such vessel shall depart with the vessel."

The amendment was not agreed to.

Mr. PAGE moved to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. KASSON. With the permission of the House I accept the vote upon these several amendments as indicating the sense of the House touching the subsequent amendments up to and including the sixteenth section which I have offered. Therefore, if there be no objection, in order to save the House the trouble of voting upon them, I will withdraw the remaining amendments, excepting the one proposed to the seventeenth section.

There was no objection, and the amendments were accordingly withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment, proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. ROBINSON.]

The Clerk read as follows:

In the seventh line of section 5, strike out the word "within" and insert "before the expiration of."

The amendment was not agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The next amendment in order is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. CANDLER,] which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the eleventh section, as follows:

"Sec. 11. That every vessel whose master shall knowingly violate any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed forfeited to the United States, and shall be liable to seizure and condemnation in any district of the United States into which such vessel may enter or in which she may be found."

Mr. CANDLER. As I was cut off all opportunity of discussing this measure, and could not obtain five minutes during the time allowed for debate, I ask to be allowed two minutes now.

Several members objected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on striking out the eleventh section of the bill.

The motion to strike out was not agreed to.

Mr. PAGE moved to reconsider the vote by which the House refused to strike out the eleventh section of the bill; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The next amendment is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. DAWES,] which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In section 17, line 2, strike out the words "both skilled and unskilled laborers and Chinese employed in mining" and insert the words "only coolies or servile laborers, diseased or lewd persons, criminals and paupers."

The amendment was not agreed to.

Mr. PAGE moved to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The next amendment is a substitute proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CULLEN] for the seventeenth section, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 17. The words "Chinese laborers," wherever used in this act, shall be construed to mean the class known as "coolies" and all Chinese who shall have entered into contract, express or implied, to serve any person, company, or corporation for any term of months or years, or to give or pay to any such person, company, or corporation any part of his or her earnings or wages in consideration of the expenses for transportation which any such person, company, or corporation may have incurred.

The substitute was not agreed to.

Mr. PAGE moved to reconsider the vote by which the substitute

was rejected; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The next amendment is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KASSON] to strike out section 17. The Chair will state that the same motion is made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. ROBINSON.] The Clerk will report the section proposed to be stricken out.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 17. That the words "Chinese laborers," wherever used in this act, shall be construed to mean both skilled and unskilled laborers and Chinese employed in mining.

The motion to strike out was not agreed to.

Mr. PAGE moved to reconsider the vote by which the House refused to strike out the section; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will now state that all the amendments have been voted upon. There is still pending a substitute offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MCCOY] for the entire bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act to restrict Chinese immigration.

Whereas in the opinion of the Government of the United States the coming of Chinese laborers to this country endangers the good order of certain localities within the territory thereof: Therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That from and after ninety days next after the passage of this act, and until the expiration of ten years next after the passage of this act, no Chinese shall be permitted to come as laborers from China to the United States; and during such period it shall not be lawful for Chinese having come to the United States as laborers after the expiration of said ninety days to remain within the United States.

SEC. 2. All Chinese who shall come in numbers exceeding fifteen in any one vessel, or who shall come under any contract with any corporation, company, or person within the United States or China to do or perform labor, or whose transportation to the United States shall be furnished by any corporation, company, or person without charge or by virtue of a contract or agreement to pay therefor in labor or in wages, to be paid after arrival within the United States, shall be construed to come as laborers in violation of this act.

SEC. 3. That any master of any vessel of whatever nationality who shall knowingly on such vessel bring within the jurisdiction of the United States and permit to be landed any Chinese laborers from any foreign port or place in violation of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$500 for each and every such Chinese laborer so brought and may be also imprisoned for a term not exceeding one year.

SEC. 4. Any corporation, company, or person who shall, through himself, his agent or other person, directly or indirectly, import from China or any foreign port or place any Chinese as laborers, or contract for the same to be imported, or receive and employ such persons coming into the United States as laborers, or aid in procuring the importation or bringing into the United States such persons as laborers in violation of this act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$500 for each person so brought, and may be also imprisoned for a term not exceeding one year.

SEC. 5. Any vessel belonging in whole or in part to a citizen of the United States, and registered, enrolled, or otherwise licensed therein, used or employed knowingly by the owners thereof in transporting persons in violation of this act, with her tackle, apparel, furniture, and other appurtenances, shall be forfeited to the United States, and shall be liable to be seized, prosecuted, and condemned in any of the circuit courts or district courts of the United States for the district where the vessel may be found, seized, or carried.

SEC. 6. The foregoing sections shall not apply to Chinese who were in the United States on the 17th day of November, 1880; nor shall the two foregoing sections apply to the case of any master whose vessel, being bound to a port not within the United States, shall come within the jurisdiction of the United States by reason of being in distress or in stress of weather.

SEC. 7. In order to the faithful execution of articles 1 and 2 of the treaty between the United States and the Empire of China, ratified July 19, 1881, and to the faithful execution of this act, every Chinese who may be entitled by said treaty and this act as an ordinary immigrant to come within the United States, except such as resided in the United States on the 17th day of November, 1880, or who shall have come within the United States within ninety days next after the passage of this act, shall obtain the permission of the Chinese Government in each case, to be evidenced by a passport issued by said government, which passport shall be in the English language or accompanied by a translation into English, showing such permission, with the name of the permitted person in his proper signature, or, if signed by his mark, attested by a witness, and which passport shall state the name, title, or official rank, if any, the height, and any physical peculiarities, and place of residence in China of the person to whom the passport is issued, and that such person is entitled by the treaty under this act mentioned to come within the United States. This passport and the identity of the person named in it shall, before such person goes on board any vessel to proceed to the United States, be vided by the indorsement of the diplomatic representative of the United States in the Empire of China, or of the consular representative of the United States at the port or place from which the person named in the passport is about to depart.

SEC. 8. No master of any vessel owned in whole or in part by a citizen of the United States, or by a citizen of any foreign country, shall take on board such vessel, at any foreign port or place whatever, any Chinese, except accredited officers of the Chinese Government traveling on the business of the government, unless such Chinese shall first produce to him the permission of the Chinese Government, attested by the consular officer of the United States as hereinbefore provided.

SEC. 9. The master of any vessel arriving in the United States, or any of the Territories thereof, from any foreign place whatever, at the same time that he delivers a manifest of the cargo, and if there be no cargo, then at the time of making report of entry of the vessel pursuant to law, shall, in addition to the other matters required to be reported by law, deliver and report to the collector of the district in which such vessel shall arrive a separate list of all Chinese passengers taken on board the vessel at any foreign port or place, and of all such passengers on board the vessel at that time; such list shall be sworn to by the master in the same manner as directed by law in relation to the manifest of the cargo; and the refusal or neglect of the master to comply with the provisions of this section shall receive the same penalties, disabilities, and forfeitures as are provided for a refusal or neglect to report and deliver a manifest of the cargo.

SEC. 10. This act shall not apply to diplomatic and other officers of the Chinese Government traveling upon the business of that government, whose credentials in the usual form shall be taken as equivalent to the passport in this act mentioned, and shall exempt them and their body and household servants from the provisions of this act as to other Chinese.

SEC. 11. Nothing in this act shall be construed to prohibit the ordinary and voluntary individual immigration of persons not contracted for as laborers, in numbers not exceeding fifteen in any one vessel, from the Chinese Empire, as immigration is now permitted from all other nations.

SEC. 12. Residents of the United States from the Empire of China may be admitted to citizenship according to the provisions of the uniform naturalization laws: *Provided*, That they shall have resided therein ten years, and for five years previous to their naturalization shall have adopted the manners, customs, dress, and general habits of citizens of the United States.

The substitute was not agreed to.

Mr. PAGE moved to reconsider the vote by which the substitute was rejected; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now recurs on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. PAGE. I call the previous question on the passage of the bill.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. PAGE moved to reconsider the vote by which the previous question was ordered; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. I call for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 167, nays 66, not voting 59; as follows:

YEAS—167.

Aiken,	Davis, Lowndes H.	Hutchins,	Rosecrans,
Aldrich,	De Motte,	Jones, George W.	Scranton,
Armfield,	Denster,	Jones, James K.	Shallenberger,
Atkins,	Dezendorf,	Jorgensen,	Sherwin,
Bayne,	Dibble,	Kenna,	Simonton,
Belford,	Dibrell,	King,	Singleton, Otho R.
Belmont,	Dowd,	Klotz,	Smith, A. Herr
Berry,	Dugro,	Knott,	Smith, Dietrich C.
Bingham,	Ermentrout,	Ladd,	Smith, J. Hyatt
Blackburn,	Errett,	Leedom,	Sparks,
Blanchard,	Farwell, Chas. B.	Lewis,	Spaulding,
Bliss,	Finley,	Marsh,	Speer,
Blount,	Flower,	Martin,	Springer,
Brewer,	Ford,	Matson,	Stockslager,
Brunn,	Forney,	McClure,	Strait,
Buckner,	Fulkerson,	McCook,	Talbot,
Burrows, Jos. H.	Garrison,	McKenzie,	Thomas,
Butterworth,	Geddes,	McKinley,	Thompson, P. B.
Cabell,	George,	McLane,	Tillman,
Caldwell,	Gibson,	McMillin,	Townsend, Amos
Calkins,	Guenther,	Miller,	Townsend, R. W.
Campbell,	Gunter,	Mills,	Tucker,
Cannon,	Hammond, N. J.	Money,	Turner, Henry G.
Cassidy,	Hardy,	Morey,	Turner, Oscar
Caswell,	Harmer,	Moulton,	Updegraff, J. T.
Chalmers,	Harris, Henry S.	Murch,	Upson,
Chapman,	Haseltine,	Mutchler,	Valentine,
Clark,	Hatch,	O'Neil,	Vance,
Clements,	Hazelton,	Pacheco,	Van Horn,
Cobb,	Heilman,	Page,	Warner,
Converse,	Herndon,	Paul,	Washburn,
Cook,	Hewitt, Abram S.	Payson,	Webber,
Cornell,	Hill,	Peelle,	Wellborn,
Cox, Samuel S.	Hiscock,	Phelps,	Whithorne,
Cox, William R.	Hoblitzell,	Phister,	Williams, Thomas
Covington,	Hoge,	Pound,	Willis,
Cravens,	Holman,	Randall,	Willits,
Culbertson,	Horr,	Reagan,	Wilson,
Curtin,	Houk,	Rice, Theron M.	Wise, George D.
Darrell,	House,	Richardson, Jno. S.	Wise, Morgan A.
Davidson,	Hubbard,	Robertson,	Wood, Walter A.
Davis, George R.	Hubbs,	Robinson, Wm. E.	

NAYS—66.

Anderson,	Farwell, Sewell S.	Lord,	Skinner,
Barr,	Groat,	McCold,	Spooner,
Bragg,	Hall,	Morse,	Stone,
Briggs,	Hammond, John	Norcross,	Taylor,
Browne,	Hardenbergh,	Orth,	Thompson, Wm. G.
Buck,	Harris, Benj. W.	Parker,	Tyler,
Camp,	Haskell,	Ranney,	Updegraff, Thomas
Candler,	Hawk,	Reed,	Urner,
Carpenter,	Henderson,	Rice, John B.	Wadsworth,
Chace,	Hepburn,	Rice, William W.	Wait,
Crapo,	Hooker,	Rich,	Walker,
Cullen,	Humphrey,	Richardson, D. P.	Ward,
Dawes,	Jacobs,	Ritchie,	Watson,
Deering,	Jones, Phineas	Robinson, Geo. D.	White,
Dingley,	Joyce,	Russell,	Williams, Chas. G.
Dunnell,	Kasson,	Ryan,	
Dwight,	Ketcham,	Shultz,	

NOT VOTING—59.

Allen,	Dunn,	Mason,	Ross,
Atterton,	Ellis,	Miles,	Scales,
Barbour,	Evins,	Moore,	Seaville,
Beach,	Fisher,	Morrison,	Shackelford,
Beltzhoover,	Frost,	Mosgrove,	Shelley,
Black,	Godshalk,	Muldrow,	Singleton, Jas. W.
Blaid,	Herbert,	Neal,	Steele,
Bowman,	Hewitt, G. W.	Nolan,	Stephens,
Buchanan,	Jadwin,	Oates,	Van Aernam,
Burrows, Julius C.	Kelley,	Pierce,	Van Voorhis,
Carlisle,	Lacey,	Pettibone,	West,
Clardy,	Latham,	Prescott,	Wheeler,
Colerick,	Le Fevre,	Ray,	Wood, Benjamin
Crowley,	Lindsey,	Robeson,	Young,
Cutts,	Manning,	Robinson, James S.	

So the bill was passed.

During the roll-call.

Mr. MOORE said: If I was not paired with my colleague, Mr. PETTIBONE, I would vote "no."

The following additional pairs were announced:

Mr. MOORE with Mr. SHACKELFORD.

Mr. RAY with Mr. HEWITT of Alabama.

Mr. URNER with Mr. CHAPMAN.

Mr. LEEDOM. I desire to state that my colleague from Ohio, Mr. ROBINSON, is paired with the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. COLERICK.

Mr. MANNING. On the first amendment proposed to this bill I voted, believing my pair with Mr. CUTTS, of Iowa, had terminated by its transference to Mr. COLERICK. This was the understanding of myself and the friends of the absent member. But I have discovered I was in error. But the pair between Mr. CUTTS and myself was not announced. If present, Mr. CUTTS would vote against the bill and I would vote for it.

Mr. SCOVILLE. I am paired with my colleague, Mr. VAN AERENAM. If he were here I should vote "ay."

Mr. RAY. I am paired with Mr. HEWITT, of Alabama; otherwise I should vote against this bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. My colleague from Illinois, Mr. MORRISON, is detained at his home by important business at the courts, having been summoned as a witness.

The SPEAKER. Upon this vote the ayes are 167, the noes 66. The "ayes" have it and the bill is passed. [Applause.]

Mr. PAGE moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. FULKERSON, for four days, on account of important business;

To Mr. ROSECRANS, until Wednesday next, on account of sickness; To Mr. ROBINSON, of Massachusetts, until Wednesday next; To Mr. SHACKELFORD, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family; and

To Mr. HARRIS, of Massachusetts, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

INCREASED CLERICAL FORCE FOR PENSION CASES.

The SPEAKER, by unanimous consent, laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of Congress a communication from the Secretary of War, dated March 23, 1882, with accompanying reports and estimates, recommending an increase in the clerical force in his office, and in the offices of the Adjutant-General and Surgeon-General of the Army in order that prompt replies may be made to the calls for information by the Commissioner of Pensions in pension cases under a proposed plan to accomplish the settlement of all such claims within a limited number of years; also an increased appropriation for contingent expenses for each of the offices mentioned.

CHESTER A. ARTHUR.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, March 23, 1882.

EXCHANGE OF OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a communication from the President of the Chamber of Deputies of France, in regard to the exchange of official documents; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HARBOR OF PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND.

Mr. SPOONER, by unanimous consent, submitted resolutions of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, relative to the harbor of the city of Providence; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

They are as follows:

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND, &c. IN GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
January session, A. D. 1882.

Resolutions relative to the harbor of the city of Providence.

Whereas within the past few weeks a direct railroad communication has been established between the city of Providence and the Western States, by which the varied products of that great section of country that are transported over the main trunk lines of railroad may be distributed not only throughout New England, but also forwarded to foreign lands by the unequalled facilities of Narragansett Bay; and

Whereas this new communication has been secured by the completion of the New York and New England Railroad, the managers of which have declared their willingness and their determination to afford to the city of Providence equal advantages with the city of Boston in the transportation and delivery of freight at tide-water in said city of Providence; and

Whereas the city of Providence has declared its intention to improve its tide-water facilities by the vote of its city council to expend the sum of \$75,000 during the present season in dredging that portion of the harbor within its jurisdiction; and

Whereas the Board of Trade in said city has by its action and through its officers and committees secured assurances from responsible parties that the large ocean steamers for foreign trade can and will be sent to said city as soon as the dredging now required shall be accomplished; and

Whereas it is desirable and necessary that, in view of these facts, the sum to be expended by the General Government during the approaching season should be largely augmented to the end that the present ship-channel may be deepened to a depth of not less than twenty-five feet at mean low water and widened to a width of not less than three hundred feet: Therefore,

Resolved, (the house of representatives concurring herein,) That the Senators and Representatives from this State in the Congress be requested to take such action as shall to them seem most expedient to obtain such an increase in the annual appropriation for immediate use in the harbor of Providence and the approaches thereto as will secure the deepening and widening of the main ship-channel as above set forth.

Resolved, That a duly authenticated copy of the foregoing be forwarded to each of the Senators and Representatives from this State in the Congress.

I certify the foregoing to be a true copy of resolutions passed by the General Assembly of said State, March 21, 1882.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State aforesaid, this 21st day of March, A. D. 1882.

[SEAL.]

JOSHUA M. ADDEMAN,
Secretary of State.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MARTIN. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at five o'clock and twenty minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following memorials, petitions, and other papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. AIKEN: The resolutions adopted by the Laurens County Lodge of Good Templars, relative to the alcoholic liquor traffic—to the Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. BELMONT: The petition of J. H. Hicks and 77 others, for an appropriation for the improvement of the channel from Pearsoll's dock to Flat Creek, in Hempstead Bay, Queens County, New York—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BLANCHARD: The memorial of citizens of Alexandria, Louisiana, and vicinity, for the improvement of falls on Red River and for the protection of the town of Alexandria—to the same committee.

By Mr. BLAND: Papers relating to the claim of Jacob May—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: The petition of members of Emory Fisher Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Johnstown, Pennsylvania, for the passage of the bill to establish a soldiers' home at Erie, Pennsylvania—to the same committee.

By Mr. CLEMENTS: The petition of 22 citizens of Alto, Georgia, for the reduction of the duty on sugar to a rate not exceeding 25 per cent. ad valorem—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COVINGTON: The petition of James A. Graham and other ex-supervisors of the tenth census, for additional compensation—to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. S. S. COX: Papers relating to the claim of Samuel Bromberg—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, the petition of Professor A. N. Gerault, for relief—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DEZENDORF: The petition of James Kelley and 132 other ex-soldiers and sailors, for the passage of the bill to grant \$40 per month to certain disabled soldiers and sailors—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIBRELL: The petition of Tabitha I. Blount, for a pension—to the same committee.

By Mr. DINGLEY: The petition of the Second Reformed Presbyterian church of New York City, asking for the appointment of a commission of inquiry concerning the alcoholic liquor traffic—to the Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. DOWD: The petitions of A. C. Freeman and others and of James T. Le Grand and others, for the establishment of post-routes in the State of North Carolina—severally to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DUNN: The petition of destitute citizens of Clay County, Arkansas, for relief—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GUENTHER: The resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, relative to the application for an extension of the steam grain-shovel patent—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MONEY: Papers relating to the claim of William Lott, administrator of the estate of Aaron Lott, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORSE: The petition of Delia H. Foster and A. D. Rice, praying for the passage of the French spoliation claims bill—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PHELPS: The petition of citizens of Connecticut and New York, asking for a resurvey of Long Island Sound—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, memorial of C. Hansett and others, relative to emigration—to the same committee.

By Mr. POUND: The joint resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin, in relation to the claim of the State of Wisconsin against the United States for swamp and overflowed lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SCRANTON: The petition of honorably discharged soldiers of Lackawanna County, Pennsylvania, for the passage of the bill to establish a soldiers' home at Erie, Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SKINNER: The petition of the Grand Division of the Sons of Temperance of Western New York, representing 2,000 members, for the appointment of a commission of inquiry concerning the alcoholic liquor traffic—to the same committee.

By Mr. SPARKS: The petition of Litchfield, Illinois, for the reduction of the duty on sugar to a rate not exceeding 25 per cent. ad valorem—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUCKER: Papers relating to the claim of Dr. William S. Morris—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. J. T. UPDEGRAFF: The petition of the New York Committee for the Prevention of State Regulation of Vice, asking Congress by appropriate legislation to more clearly define the scope and functions of the National Board of Health, &c.—to the Committee on the Public Health.

By Mr. URNER: The petition of Ph. Sinsz, of Baltimore, relative to the duty on diamonds—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELLBORN: The petition of Benjamin F. Daniels and others, for legislation to regulate charges for railway transportation—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WHITTHORNE: Papers relating to the claim of Dr. A. H. Brown—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLITS: The petition of Alfred A. Miller and 100 others, citizens of Blissfield, Michigan, for the passage of the bill granting pensions to soldiers and sailors of the late war who were confined in confederate prisons—to the Select Committee on the Payment of Pensions, Bounty, and Back Pay.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, March 24, 1882.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. J. BULLOCK, D. D.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE.

The bill (H. R. No. 879) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Missouri River at or near Arrow Rock, Missouri, received yesterday from the House of Representatives, was read twice by its title.

Mr. VEST. A similar bill was reported by the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, and I ask the Senate to pass this House bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no objection to the passage of the bill a little later in the day, but I hope it will not be made to interfere with the regular morning business.

Mr. VEST. I do not want to interfere with the morning business; but we can dispose of the bill in a minute. It is a mere formal matter. A similar bill is on our tables reported by the Committee on Commerce of the Senate; the House of Representatives simply passed the same bill and sent it over here in advance.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no objection to the bill at all except that it ought not to be taken up without a quorum, and it ought not to be taken up at this hour in the morning, I think.

Mr. COCKRELL. The same bill passed the Senate at the last Congress.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no objection to the passage of the bill when we get through the morning business. I think we had better go on with the regular morning business. In the course of half an hour, as soon as the regular morning business is through, I shall not object to the bill being taken up.

Mr. COCKRELL subsequently said: I hope the bill from the House laid before the Senate this morning will be acted upon now. There will be no objection to it. A similar bill was at the former Congress reported favorably from the Committee on Commerce and passed the Senate, and a similar bill was reported favorably to the Senate from the Committee on Commerce at this session, and is now on the Calendar. The same bill is now laid before the Senate, having passed the House.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The Acting Secretary read the bill.

Mr. McMILLAN. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Missouri whether a bill of this character has not been reported to the Senate by the Committee on Commerce?

Mr. VEST. The same bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. This is precisely the same as the bill which was reported by my colleague [Mr. VEST] from the Committee on Commerce. The two bills are copies of each other.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WITHDRAWAL OF A PETITION.

Mr. SHERMAN. I presented the other day the petition of George Crilly, praying that the United States resume possession of the Des Moines lands in Iowa. I am informed by the public prints that it contains various allegations in regard to many persons which if I had understood I certainly should not have presented it. I remember that when I received the petition I turned to the Senator from Iowa, [Mr. McDILL,] this man being a resident of Iowa, and called his attention to the fact that it referred to him in rather an unpleasant way. I asked him whether under the circumstances I should present it, as I would not present a petition disrespectful to any officer of the Government, and especially to a member of the body. He said sim-

ply that he knew Mr. Crilly; that the right of petition is sacred, and he had no objection to its presentation. I thereupon presented it.

Mr. MORRILL. The petitioner is crazy?

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not know whether he is crazy or not, but I ask leave to withdraw the petition. I would not have presented it if I had read it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The petition will be withdrawn.

Mr. SAWYER. I wish to present a memorial—

Mr. BECK. What was done with the petition alluded to by the Senator from Ohio?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It was withdrawn.

Mr. SHERMAN. I asked leave to withdraw it. I think if the statements I have seen are correct, and I am told by a Senator that they are correct, it is a paper reflecting upon different members of the Senate for official conduct.

Mr. BECK. I saw the petition this morning, and saw the reflection made upon the Presiding Officer of the Senate and upon the Senate itself. I thought the Senator from Ohio perhaps did not understand it when he presented it. The reason why I take some interest in the matter is because some men who do not like the position I have taken in regard to the arrears of pensions have seen fit to send petitions of the same sort reflecting upon me, and I wanted to know if a petition could be presented reflecting upon the President of this body or any other member of the body. I wished to have that question settled.

Mr. SHERMAN. I stated a moment ago that I glanced at the petition in a general way—it was four or five pages long—and I saw that it reflected somewhat upon the Senator from Iowa, who represents in part the State in which the man lives. I turned to him and asked him about it, and he said he knew Crilly; that he was a man who had suffered a great deal on account of the Des Moines River lands controversy, and he thought I ought to present it. I did not see the name of any other Senator mentioned in it.

Mr. BECK. I am very glad the petition is withdrawn. It is the most disrespectful petition I ever saw.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SAWYER presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, remonstrating against the renewal of the patents for steam grain-shovels; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a memorial of the Legislature of Wisconsin, in favor of Congress taking control of the Sturgeon Bay Ship Canal, connecting Green Bay with Lake Michigan, in that State, upon such terms as are just and proper; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HOAR. I have in my hand sundry memorials remonstrating against the passage of the Chinese bill, signed by the pastors of churches in New York and other citizens of great influence and power, and among them some Chinese members of churches. I suppose the memorials should lie on the table, a bill relating to the subject having passed the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. They will lie on the table.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of the New York Committee for the Prevention of State Regulation of Vice, praying Congress by appropriate legislation to define the scope and functions of the National Board of Health, and to provide that the power delegated to said board shall not be employed to promote any scheme of regulated prostitution; which was referred to the Select Committee to investigate and report the best means of preventing the introduction and spread of Epidemic Diseases.

Mr. PLUMB presented a resolution adopted at the homesteaders' meeting at Washington, Kansas, March 15, 1882, in favor of such speedy legislation by Congress as will protect actual settlers with titles from the Government in the peaceable and quiet occupancy and possession of their homes; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. VEST. I am directed by the Committee on Territories, to whom was referred the bill (S. No. 954) to authorize the President of the United States, in conjunction with the State of Texas, to run and mark the boundary lines between a part of the territory of the United States and the State of Texas, and to complete the survey of said lines authorized to be surveyed, run, and marked under the act of Congress approved June 5, 1858, to report it without amendment and with a written report. This bill affects the northern boundary of the State of Texas. The Legislature of the State of Texas meets upon the 6th of April, I believe, and one of the questions to be submitted by the governor's message is the question involved in this bill. I shall not call up the bill now, but give notice that at an early day I shall ask the Senate to take it up and pass it.

Mr. MAXEY. I beg to say to the Senate, in connection with the bill just reported, that the Legislature of our State will meet in special session on the 6th of April. By the constitution its session is limited to thirty days. In order to run the boundary line there must be a joint boundary commission, and therefore a corresponding act to this must be passed by our Legislature. Hence the necessity for early action upon this bill, which is to settle an unsettled boundary. I hope the request made by the Senator from Missouri who reported the bill will be complied with by the Senate and that there may be